

### Cross-cultural, cross-societal and cross-national research

Rokkan, Stein

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version  
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:  
GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

#### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Rokkan, S. (1993). Cross-cultural, cross-societal and cross-national research. *Historical Social Research*, 18(2), 6-54.  
<https://doi.org/10.12759/hsr.18.1993.2.6-54>

#### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

#### Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more Information see:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

## Cross-Cultural, Cross-Societal and Cross-National Research

*Stein Rokkan\**

**Abstract:** This article (first published in 1970) seeks to chart a few salient trends in the efforts undertaken in the twentieth century to internationalize the social sciences; it focuses on one single movement in the contemporary social sciences: the efforts to advance cross-cultural, cross-societal and cross-national research. The article introduces a vocabulary for the discussion of important differentiations within this realm of research activity, points to salient characteristics of the contemporary developments in this direction, and considers questions of strategy and organization in the further advancement of such international endeavours.

This chapter seeks to chart a few salient trends in the efforts undertaken in the twentieth century to internationalize the social sciences.

There are many ways of internationalizing a science: through the circulation of papers and the exchange of scholars, through the organization of conferences and congresses, through the sharing of observational and experimental data, through the co-ordination of research, through cooperative institution-building of one sort or another... This chapter will not cover all such modes of internationalization, but will focus on one single movement in contemporary social science: the efforts to advance cross-cultural, cross-societal and cross-national research.

Historians of scientific development agree that a number of avenues of internationalization should be differentiated. In the social sciences we can trace the ups and downs in the international communication of papers, monographs and treatises and we can map the spread of schools of thought, the diffusion of concepts and theories and the exportation of techniques and styles of analysis. But we can also point to a variety of efforts, some short-lived and erratic, others continuous and systematic, to co-ordinate the gathering of information and the analysis of data across a number of distinct cultures, societies or political enti-

---

\* Originally published in: *Main Trends of Research in the Human and the Social Sciences*, Paris: UNESCO/Mouton 1970, pp. 645-689. We are grateful to the first editors for kindly permitting us to republish this article.

ties. This chapter will concentrate on such efforts of comparative research: it will introduce a vocabulary for the discussion of important differentiations within this realm of research activity, point to salient characteristics of the contemporary developments in this direction, and consider questions of strategy and organization in the further advancement of such international endeavours.

## I. Some Elementary Distinctions

Any proposition in the social sciences implies some form of comparison. You state that children will go through a series of stages in their intellectual development: to test this you classify a number of subjects by age and compare the age groups on a series of variables. You state that men are more likely to defy social norms than women: you collect whatever data can be found to establish indicators of conformity or deviance and proceed to compare scores for the two sexes. You state that Frenchmen are less likely to submit to majority pressure than Norwegians: you devise some appropriate test in samples of each population and compare the data for the two.

In this trivial sense all social science is comparative. But most social science endeavours are limited to comparisons within single cultural domains, single societies, single nations. Most important advances in methodology, technique, and the organization of research have been made within such single settings, but the findings of such one-site studies have tended to frustrate the theory-oriented social scientists: what sorts of invariances do they establish? what would happen if the same procedure were used in a different culture, in a different social structure, in a different political community? what models can be constructed to account for similarities or variations in the results of replications across distinct research settings?

There are many ways of classifying attempts at cross-site replications, cross-setting analyses, but there is as yet no established terminology for the mapping of the many variations in the structure of research enterprises. Cross-site studies can be organized *within* a cultural domain, society or politically organized territory: the typical cross-sectional sample survey is a cross-site study to the extent that it allows analyses of variations across distinct cultural-social-political contexts. But this is only the first of many steps towards the universalization of social science research operations: the greater the range of cultures, societies or political systems covered, the greater the challenge to the methodologist, and the greater the opportunities for theory development. Many social scientists are reluctant to go all the way: they feel on safer ground within their one culture, society or nation and favour the development of techniques and the testing of propositions in that single setting. Others are tempted to go beyond the one setting but restrict their comparisons to sets of structurally similar cultures, societies, politics: the Melanesian cultures, feudal societies, the ad-

vanced Western nations, the 'Anglo-Saxon' democracies. The most ambitious (or the most foolhardy) comparativists look forward to a universal science of variations in human institutions and social arrangements and seek to establish bases for comparisons across all known units, whether elementary cultures, transitional societies or complex empires and nation-states.

The terms for such attempts at systematic research across several settings vary with the character of the unit of comparison: in some cases *cross-cultural* is preferred, in others *cross-societal*, in yet others *cross-national*.

None of these terms has entered the standard vocabulary of the sciences of man: it is noteworthy that there is no entry for any of them even in the UNESCO-sponsored *Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. The term *cross-cultural* gained currency in the late thirties: it was first used by the Yale team of anthropologists in the reports on their endeavours to assemble and code available information on a range of primitive societies and to analyse the statistical associations among the attributes of these societies.<sup>1</sup> The parallel terms *cross-societal* and *cross-national* were coined later: they were used to describe similar sequences of research procedures, but for different types of units. The term *cross-societal*, still rare in the literature, was introduced to cover comparisons over a broad range of territorially and culturally distinct collectivities, whether 'primitive', 'transitional' or fully developed.<sup>2</sup> The term *cross-national* has gained wider acceptance, at least in the Anglo-American scholarly community: it is used to describe comparisons across legally and politically distinct populations or systems of interaction, typically developing or highly developed sovereign nation-states. The current tendency is to reserve 'cross-cultural' for comparisons of elementary societies of the type documented in such repositories as the *Human Relations Area Files*, 'cross-national' for comparisons of societies at some higher level of social, economic or political development, and 'cross-societal' for comparisons across the entire range of human collectivities, whatever their level of development.

These distinctions bear on only one of several dimensions to be taken into account in the analysis of variations in research operations. It is not enough merely to be told about the characteristics of the range of sites or units; there are also important distinctions to be made in terms of the organization of each study and the levels of the variables covered.

Cross-cultural, cross-societal or cross-national studies can clearly be organized in a variety of ways: the study may be carried out on secondary materials in one single centre or one single site, it may be initiated in one centre but require

---

<sup>1</sup> See G. P. MURDOCK, 'The Cross-Cultural Survey', *American Sociological Review* 5 (3), 1940, pp. 361-370; A. J. KOBLEN, 'New Ways of Presenting an Old Idea: The Statistical Method in Social Anthropology', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 82 (2), 1952, pp. 129-146.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed discussion see R. M. MARSH, *Comparative Sociology: A Codification of Cross-Societal Analysis*, New York, Harcourt, 1967, Chap. 1.

data gathering by centres in the other cultures, societies or nations, or it may be organized through close cooperation within a network of centres. A study may be cross-national in character without being inter-national and international without being cross-national.

		SITES/UNITS OF STUDY	
		<i>Within one nation</i>	<i>Within several nations</i>
RESEARCH ORGANIZATION	<i>In one nation only</i>	I The typical single-nation study	II Typically secondary analysis of data already available for several nations
	<i>In several nations</i>	III Cooperative inter-national research in one nation (e.g. UNESCO in Germany)	IV The typical co-operative cross-national study

In this terminology, the prefix *cross-* stresses the objects of comparison while the prefix *inter-* relates to a characteristic of the research organization. This distinction has gained ground in Anglo-American discourse<sup>3</sup> but is still difficult to express in French: the difference between *inter-national* and *international* is not yet widely accepted. *Transnational*<sup>4</sup> is a potential contender. A group of psychologists currently engaged in the promotion of replications in a number of countries prefer to describe their efforts as activities within transnational social psychology. This is essentially a matter of efficiency of communication: if two terms are understood with equal ease and at the same level of precision, the reasons for preferring one to the other are only aesthetic. What counts is not the particular terminological convention, but the analytical distinctions. In the terminology introduced in this chapter, a cross-national study can clearly be international at several distinct levels of the research operation:

- at the *design* level (scholars from all or most of the countries covered are consulted on the structure and details of the design, e.g., the common variables to be tapped in a comparable sample survey and the specific questions to be asked within each national population);
- in the *collection of data* (a cross-national study may have been designed for scholars from one nation, but the data gathering is carried out by research organizations located in each nation: the typical United States-based com-

<sup>3</sup> For an early discussion of such distinctions see H. C. J. DUIJKER and S. ROKKAN, 'Organizational Aspects of Cross-National Social Research', *Journal of Social Issues* 10 (4), 1954, pp. 8-24.

parative survey operation);

- in the *analysis of the data* (the data may have been produced independently in each nation, but the analysis is carried out jointly by an international team: typically an OECD or UN analysis of national statistical data);
- in the *interpretation of the data* (even the analysis may have been carried out within the one centre, but scholars from each of the countries are consulted on the interpretation of the findings).

Not all these 2<sup>2</sup> modes of cross-national research are represented in the literature, but at least six of them are frequent enough to merit some comment:

DESIGN	DATA	ANAL-	INTER-
	GATHER-	YSIS	PRETATION
	ING		

(N for National; / for International)

N	N	N	N	This is the most extreme mode of single-scholar, single-centre research across several nations: there is no element of international collaboration or communication at any stage of the research process.
---	---	---	---	---

Typically, studies in this mode focus on documents and data *already collected*. Most *cross-cultural* studies carried out on the basis of ethnographic reports are of this type: the original data may have been generated by scholars of *different* nationalities but *independently* of each other, and the low literacy of the cultures compared will only rarely allow direct consultations with native scholars at the analysis or the interpretation stage. Many of the increasingly sophisticated comparisons of *official statistical data* (demographic, social-structural, medical, economic, administrative, political) tend to come close to the same mode: the data are simply collated from the available sources within one single research centre and no serious attempt is made at consulting 'native' scholars in the later stages of processing and interpretation.

N	I	N	N	This is the 'imperialist' mode: the design is decided, and analysis and interpretation pursued within one centre in one 'leader' nation while the actual data gathering is carried out by some international network of field organizations. Most cross-national sample surveys so far carried out have been in this mode: a scholar or a research centre in a wealthy country 'buys' data from a range of less fortunate countries. <sup>4</sup>
---	---	---	---	---

<sup>4</sup> For listings of such studies see S. ROKKAN, S. VERBA, J. VIET and E. ALMASY,

- N* *I* *IN* This is the 'replicative' mode: a design or research instrument developed in one country is imported to another country and the two sets of collected data are compared in detail. Major examples include the series of replications of the British studies of occupational rank and intergenerational mobility under the auspices of the first Research Committee of the International Sociological Association<sup>5</sup>; the large set of replications of the '\*F (for Fascism) scale' initially developed in California by the authors of *The Authoritarian Personality*,<sup>6</sup> the increasing number of cross-national replications of the MCCLELAND 'n-Achievement' tests and of the OSGOOD Semantic Differential techniques.<sup>7</sup>
- / / *N* *N* These are cases of 'regression to the single-nation mode': initial international cooperation in design and data gathering but disruption of communications at the later stages of processing. A well-known example is the four-city study of social mobility organized by the Latin American Centre for Social Science Research at Rio de Janeiro: the instruments were jointly designed and the data gathering operations carried out roughly as agreed, but there was hardly any international collaboration in the further processing of the data.<sup>8</sup>
- I* *I* *I* *N* This represents the next step toward full internationalization of the research process: collaboration at all stages throughout the analysis but separate presentations and interpretations of findings. An interesting example is the two parallel studies carried out during the early fifties under the auspices of the Organization for Comparative Social Research: one set of

*Comparative Survey Analysis: A Trend Report and Bibliography*, Paris, Mouton, 1969.

<sup>5</sup> For a summary of the findings see S. M. MILLER, 'Comparative Social Mobility', *Current Sociology* 9, 1960, pp. 1-89. For a further listing of the literature see S. ROKKAN *et al*, *op. cit.*

<sup>6</sup> See S. ROKKAN *et al*, *op. cit.*, Sect. III. 22.

<sup>7</sup> See C. OSGOOD, 'On the Strategy of Cross-National Research into Subjective Culture', *Social Science Information* 6 (1), Feb. 1967, pp. 6-37.

<sup>8</sup> For details see G. GERMANI, 'Social Stratification and Social Mobility in Four Latin American Cities: A Note on the Research Design', *América Latina* 6 (3), 1963, pp. 91-93, and the various studies listed in S. ROKKAN *et al*, *op. cit.*, Sect. III. 43.

group experiments with adolescent boys, and one sample survey of primary and secondary school teachers in each of seven countries.<sup>9</sup> These studies were jointly planned and executed and much of the analysis was carried out within an international team, but there was very little opportunity for detailed consultations in the final preparation of the interpretive reports.

I I I I

This mode represents the peak of internationalization: collaborative efforts across all or most countries from the earliest planning stage to the final stage of publication. Perhaps the best example is the twelve-nation study of achievement in mathematics: this was organized under the auspices of the UNESCO Institute of Education in Hamburg. Financed from a variety of national sources, the study proceeded step by step through a series of detailed, effective consultations of experts and scholars from all the countries participating in the venture.<sup>10</sup>

This is clearly a dimension of great practical importance in the conduct of cross-cultural, cross-societal and cross-national research. There is no single optimal strategy. The I-I-I-I mode is possibly the ideal one, but it is costly, sometimes very cumbersome and, at least in some fields and for some countries, very hard on the nerves of the participants. The mushrooming of facilities for direct access to data will clearly simplify procedures but will still leave a heavy burden of responsibility on the scholar. He may be able to escape the strain of cooperation and compromise at the level of the design and the data gathering and do all the analysis on his own computer, but he will fail miserably if he forgets to consult his colleagues in the countries concerned at the final stage of the research process: interpretation of the findings and presentation of the report. The current rush of archival developments must not lull us into complacency about the levels of international cooperation in the social sciences. However cross-national their coverage, computerized data banks cannot in themselves create the intellectual environments for effective advances in comparative research. There is no easy substitute for the intensive interaction of individual experts within organized international networks of the type built up in such fields as economics, demography and education. In fact the rush to feed computers with unevaluated data from a variety of different countries may

---

<sup>9</sup> See H. DUUKER and S. ROKKAN, *op cit.*

<sup>10</sup> T. HUS-EN (ed.), *International Study of Achievement in Mathematics*, Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell; New York, Wiley, 1967, 2 vols.: see especially the *timetable* of the project, pp. 62-63.



produce a great deal of numerological nonsense. It will be essential to build in safeguards through close contacts with local informants and experts. In his recent warnings against the 'instant data' schemes, Kingsley Davis pointed out the risk 'of progressive diffusion of misinformation' and the danger of serious misinterpretation of analysis findings through ignorance of variations in the cultural, social and political contexts.<sup>11</sup> This, obviously, is not an attempt to decry the archiving of data, but a plea for the development of broader cross-national analysis-centres. It is not enough to make the data computer-readable; they have to make empirical and analytical sense and they have to be evaluated in the light of thorough contextual knowledge. The strict evaluation procedures established for the data archives of the Inter-University Consortium at Ann Arbor, Michigan, may be taken as a model for operations in other countries. The object is not the accumulation of *any* *prima facie* comparable data, but the organization of systematic files of information likely to offer *clear analytical payoffs*.

So far we have touched on externals only: the choice of units or sites of comparison, the mode of cooperation in the research process. But the bulk of the current discussions of the potentialities and difficulties of comparative research focus on the inner structure of study designs and analysis operations: what sorts of variables are compared? at what levels of each population or system? what sorts of hypotheses, what kinds of theories are or can be tested? how much content is brought into each analysis and which contextual dimensions are most likely to make a difference?

The level-of-analysis distinctions introduced by Paul F. Lazarsfeld and his colleagues in their work on the logic of survey analysis in the fifties has had a profound impact on current discussions of the rationale of comparative research.

For simple two-level analyses the basic distinction can be set out as follows:<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> K. DAVIS, 'Problems and Solutions in International Comparison for Social Science Purposes', paper for the International Conference on Comparative Social Research in Developing Countries, Buenos Aires, Sept. 1964. The arguments for the archiving of cross-country data have been marshalled in B. RUSSETT *et al*, *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*, New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1964, and in H. ALKER, Jr., 'Research Possibilities Using Aggregate Political and Social Data', in: S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Comparative Research across Cultures and Nations*, Paris, Mouton, 1968.

<sup>12</sup> This is a synthesis of several formulations in the writings of LAZARSELD and his collaborators: see especially P. KENDALL and P. F. LAZARSELD, *Problems of Survey Analysis*, in: R. K. MERTON and P. F. LAZARSELD (eds.), *Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of 'The American Soldier'*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1950, pp. 133-196; E. A. SUCHMAN, *The Comparative Method in Social Research*, Ithaca (N.Y.), Cornell University, 1955, 88 pp., mimeo; P. F. LAZARSELD and M. ROSENBERG (eds.), *The Language of Social Research*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1955, especially Sect. IV, 'Formal Aspects of Research on Human Groups', pp.

<i>Primary personal characteristic</i> An attribute or variable characterizing an individual <i>qua</i> individual	<i>Examples</i> Sex Weight Pigmentation Incidence of some disease	<i>Derived unit characteristics</i> A rate, an average, a parameter of some distribution within the unit (e.g., the national population)
An attribute or variable characterizing an individual <i>qua</i> member of some group or social category	Level of education reached, occupation, organizational role	A rate, an average, a parameter
<i>Relational characteristics</i> An attribute or variable characterizing a relationship of one individual to other individuals	Frequency of communication between A and B, sociometric choice	A rate, an average, a parameter or a derived structural attribute of the unit (e.g., 'cohesion')
<i>Contextual characteristics</i> An attribute or variable characterizing an individual through the characteristics of the unit he is part of or is exposed to	<i>Unit datum:</i> national political community highly dependent on foreign trade <i>Personal datum:</i> a citizen of such a nation	<i>Primary unit characteristics</i> An attribute or variable characteristic of the unit <i>qua</i> unit, not derivable from the characteristics of its individual members

This scheme posits only two levels of variation: the individual and the nextlevel unit. In cross-societal and cross-national research it will often prove necessary to link up variations at *three or more* levels: at the level of the individual, at the level of his immediate neighbourhood or workplace (e.g., the number of employees), at the level of his local community (e.g., peripheral or near the national centre) and at the level of the nation itself (e.g., neutral or committed in the cold war). The potentialities of such multi-level reasoning are exemplified in a paradigm for the analysis of cross-national variations in the extent of political participation: see Fig. I.<sup>13</sup>

Such schemes could be multiplied for variable after variable. Perhaps the clearest illustration of a multi-level, cross-national research design is the one

290-384; P. F. LAZARSELD and H. MENZEL, 'On the Relationships between Individual and Collective Properties', in: A. ETZIONI (ed.), *Complex Organizations*, New York, Holt, 1961, pp. 422-440.

<sup>13</sup> Adapted from S. ROKKAN, 'The Comparative Study of Political Participation', in: A. RANNEY (ed.), *Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics*, Urbana (Ill.), Univ. of Illinois Press, 1962, pp.58-59.

Fig. 1: *A typology of 'orders' of comparison: exemplified by propositions on electoral turnout rates*

Order	Alternatives set for citizen		Collectivities significant for citizen	Citizen's regular roles	political behaviour	Examples of propositions derived or derivable from the given order of comparison*:
	National level (N)	Local level (L)	(C)	(R)	(B)	
First					micro	a) Turnout rates (B) for national electorates higher in W.Europe than in the US.
Second	N <i>macro</i>				micro	b) Turnout rates (B) higher in systems with official registration and short ballots (N) than in systems with voluntary registration and complex ballots.
	L	<i>macro</i>			micro	c) Turnout rates (B) for localities increase with the proportions of votes cast for dominant party (L).
	C		<i>macro</i>		micro	d) Turnout rates (B) for localities increase with increasing socio-economic or cultural homogeneity (C).
	R			<i>micro</i>	micro	e) Turnout rates (B) higher for men and married citizens than for women and single citizens (R).
Third	NL <i>macro macro</i>				micro	f) Turnout rates (B) for localities increase with one party dominance (L) in PR systems (N), not in plurality systems.
	NC <i>macro</i>		<i>macro</i>		micro	g) Turnout rates (B) for localities more likely to increase with increasing socio-economic homogeneity (C) within markedly status-polarised party systems (N).
	NR <i>macro</i>			<i>micro</i>	micro	h) Educational differential in political participation (R-B) smaller the more marked status polarization of the national party system (N).
	LC	<i>macro macro</i>			micro	i) Turnout rates (B) not so likely to increase with increasing socio-economic homogeneity (C) in non-partisan local elections (L).
	LR	<i>macro</i>		<i>micro</i>	micro	j) Educational differential in political participation (R-B) will be more marked the less partisan the politics of the locality (L).
	CR		<i>macro</i>	<i>micro</i>	micro	k) Status differential in turnout (R-B) decreases with increasing residential segregation of workers vs. others (C).

\*For references, see p. 53.

presented in the report on the *International Study of Achievement in Mathematics*. In this twelve-country study, the dependent micro-variations, scores on a mathematics test, are analysed as functions of variables on at least five levels: at the level of the *pupil* (*B* and *R* in Fig. 1), of the *family* (parents' occupation and education: a C-type variable in Fig. 1), of the *school* (also a C-type variable), of the *locality* (urban-rural, size: *L* in Fig. 1) and of the *national educational system* (*N* in Fig. 1: *global* attributes such as the number of years of compulsory schooling, *aggregate* variables such as the proportion of 16- or 20-year-olds attending school).

But cross-national studies need not only proceed through such level-by-level search for sources of variance in the behaviours of individuals; an equally powerful case can be made for comparative macro-studies at the societal or the national level.

In fact it has been argued that this is the essence of cross-national research, that a comparative study can claim to be cross-national only if it serves to test propositions about nation-states and national populations as units of analysis in their own right.<sup>14</sup>

In terms of the levels-of-variation terminology introduced by Lazarsfeld, this would amount to a decision to reserve 'cross-national' for analyses of variables at the level of the independent national system, whether aggregate (derived from statistical summaries of information on lower-level units such as localities, households or individuals), structural (derived from information on predominant forms of interaction among the constituent units), global (a primary characteristic of the national entity, not derivable from any sub-unit characteristics), or contextual (derived from information on a higher-level unit, e.g., membership in an international alliance of given characteristics).

This attempt at terminological legislation is clearly based on analogy with the anthropologists' use of 'cross-cultural\*. When Murdock and his followers carry out statistical analyses on associations of the attributes of the cultures they have sampled, they are not testing propositions concerning variations in the behaviours of such constituent units as households, but are concentrating on variations at the level of the entire society. To them this is the obvious procedure. They deal with small units with minimal internal variance, and the reports from which they code their attributes, rarely, if ever, dwell on sources of statistical variations among localities, households or individuals. The situation is fundamentally different for the comparative student of nations. He is faced with a choice: he must either operate on the level of the elementary micro-units and test propositions about the sources of variations at that level or at the higher levels of contextuality, *or* he must carry out his analyses at the macrolevel of the total nation and test out propositions on the sources of aggregate, structural or global variations. It is a crucial characteristic of the nation-state that it is a

<sup>14</sup> T. K. HOPKINS and I. WALLERSTEIN, 'The Comparative Study of National Societies', *Social Science Information* 6 (5), 1967, pp. 25-58.

unit of statistical production: one might go so far as to say that part of the definition of the modern bureaucratic nation is that it develops services for the collection and analysis of data on its citizens and their transactions. But this sets a dilemma for the comparativist: he can remain at the level of the lower unit data collected in country after country and test his propositions across nations, or he can treat each nation as a global unit in its own right and use whatever data he can find for each of them and test propositions as to the sources of variations among nations. Comparative studies of the first type take the form of replication and contextual specification: data are gathered in several countries to test such propositions as 'the more years of formal education, the higher the level of political participation', and the comparative analysis of the differential outcomes leads to the formulation of propositions on conditioning contextual factors such as 'the class distinctiveness of the party system' or 'the openness of recruitment channels'.<sup>15</sup> Comparative studies of the second type essentially take the same form as the cross-cultural studies in the Murdock tradition. The principal difference is in the character of the variables: most of the cross-cultural work consists in analyses of the degree of association among dichotomous or trichotomous traits,<sup>16</sup> while the variables characteristic of cross-national studies are much more frequently continuous and allow some sort of correlational procedure.<sup>17</sup>

These two types of procedure, the micro-oriented replication-cum-specification operation and the macro-oriented analysis of associations and correlations among aggregate, structural or global properties, are clearly very different sorts of enterprises, and whether it is advisable to lump them together as 'cross-national' remains questionable. In the first case, nations provide so many distinctive sites for replications and contextual specifications; in the second they constitute units for analysis in their own right.

Relying primarily on the analogy with the HRAF-type procedure, Hopkins and Wallerstein suggest that the term *cross-national* be reserved for the second type of study and the replication-cum-specification studies simply be labelled *multi-national*.

<sup>15</sup> This particular example is taken from S. ROKKAN and A. CAMPBELL, 'Citizen Participation in Political Life: Norway and the United States of America', *International Social Science Journal* 12 (4), 1960, pp. 69-99.

<sup>16</sup> For convenient collections of such cross-classifications see I. D. COULT and R. W. HABENSTEIN, *Cross-Tabulations of Murdock's World Ethnographic Sample*, Columbia (Mo.), Univ. of Missouri Press, 1965, and R. B. TEXTOR, *A Cross-Cultural Summary*, New Haven, HRAF Press, 1969.

<sup>17</sup> A typically 'Murdockian' treatment of politics = nation-states is presented in the largely computer-produced collection by A. S. BANKS and R. B. TEXTOR, *A Cross-Polity Survey*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1963. A useful collection of examples of continuous cross-national variable rankings is B. RUSSETT *et al*, *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators*, *op. cit.*

There is every good reason for introducing terminology to distinguish between the two types of inquiry, but it is probably too late at this stage to make all practitioners in the field change their usage and reserve the term 'cross-national' for only one of the two types of procedure, and at that the one less represented in the research literature.<sup>18</sup>

To most practitioners the prefix *cross* suggests the testing of identical hypotheses across a number of sites and 'cross-national' seems a quick and economic term for expressing just this.<sup>19</sup> It would seem easier to introduce a differentiating term for the second type of procedure: cross-national macro-comparisons, for example. But this is a matter of little importance in the long run. As more social scientists are drawn into research enterprises of this kind, terminology will gradually become differentiated to facilitate communication, and textbooks will finally decide among the competing conventions of discourse.

## II. Three Traditions of Comparative Research\*

The history of international efforts in the social sciences offers a series of paradoxes. The nineteenth century pioneers in the fields of statistics, sociology and anthropology were, almost without exception, ardent advocates of the comparative method and endeavoured to establish an internationally and inter-culturally valid corpus of knowledge on variations and regularities in the functioning and development of human societies. But this aim proved difficult to reconcile with their other aims: to establish strict canons of evidence and inference in the social sciences, and to ensure a high level of analytical precision. The very efforts made by the early pioneers to gain academic recognition for the new disciplines tended to force their disciples to abandon universal comparisons and to focus their endeavours either on the local and the concrete, as in anthropology and sociology, or on the abstract and the untestable, as in economics. The social sciences had to establish their methodological status and win recognition in the academies of each nation. In this struggle it became more and more difficult to maintain the initial world-wide perspective. Disciplines gained their academic honours through increased attention to metho-

<sup>18</sup> A check on usage in the titles collected in S. ROKKAN *et al*, *Comparative Survey Analysis*, *op. cit.*, and in R. M. MARSH, *Comparative Sociology*, *op. cit.*, reveals widespread acceptance of the usage of 'cross-national' for replicative studies.

<sup>19</sup> An early definition of 'cross-national research' runs: 'research undertaken for comparative purposes on the same categories of data across several different national populations or equivalent sections of different national populations,' H. DUIJKER and S. ROKKAN, *Journal of Social Issues* 10 (4), 1954, p. 9.

\* This section represents a heavily revised and updated revision of my Introduction to R. L. MERRITT and S. ROKKAN (eds.), *Comparing Nations*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1966.

dological rigour and through deliberate concentration on well-delimited inquiries or on abstract modelling. The very success of the new sciences discouraged cross-cultural and cross-national generalization. The disciplines gained in methodological precision but in the process lost sight of the original aim: the development of systematic knowledge of the world's societies through comparisons.<sup>20</sup>

As a result, the social sciences were largely unprepared for the onrush of demands for concrete comparative research in the 1950s. The many efforts toward international economic and political integration, the numerous programmes of aid to the poorer countries of the world, the campaigns to fight illiteracy, to improve agriculture, to introduce basic industrial skills - all increased the demand for knowledge of social, economic and cultural conditions throughout the world and accentuated the need for systematic comparative research. But the social sciences were not ready for these tasks. The theoretical underpinnings of any attempt at cross-cultural or cross-national comparison were poor and fragmentary. Very little, if anything, had been done within each discipline to develop the tools of analysis and the testing procedures required in handling data at such different levels of comparability and from such differing cultural contexts. Even more discouraging was the fact that only a few scattered beginnings had been made to ensure adequate data bases for systematic comparisons across the societies of the world.

Three basic categories of data can be distinguished for comparisons across human populations:

First, 'process produced' data, data generated through the very processes of living, working, interacting in the societies to be compared, from plain material evidence through all kinds of artifacts to the varieties of symbolic representations of ideas, activities and events, whether drawings, tales, messages or documents.

Secondly, the data of observations and descriptions, whether by historians or lawyers, travellers or missionaries, academically trained linguists, ethnographers or political scientists.

And thirdly, data from standardized enumerations, sample surveys, tests and other efforts to elicit information about units within each territorial population, whether communities, work places, households or individual subjects.

<sup>20</sup> There is no comprehensive history of the vicissitudes of the comparative method in the social sciences. Among the most discerning are F. J. TEGGART, *Theory of History*, New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1925; A. KOBLEN, 'New Ways of Presenting and Old Idea: The Statistical Method in Social Anthropology', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 82 (2), 1952, pp. 129-146; E. H. ACKERKNECHT, 'On the Comparative Method in Anthropology', pp. 117-125 in: R. F. SPENCER (ed.), *Method and Perspective in Anthropology*, Minneapolis, Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1954; S. TAX, 'From Lafitau to Radcliffe-Brown, a Short History of the Study of Social Organization', pp. 443-480 in: F. EGGAN (ed.), *Social Anthropology of North American Tribes*, enl. ed., Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1955; K. E. BOCK, *The Acceptance of Histories*, Berkeley, Univ. of California Press, 1956.

The ethnographic museums and historical archives of the world are replete with 'process produced\* data, but the items assembled in these repositories rarely lend themselves to the analysis of regularities within and across societies. Most are stored there because of their cultural or historical uniqueness, not because of their potential use in social science comparisons. For such repositories to be useful for testing generalizations in the social sciences, they would have to ensure representative coverage of each category of data for each of the societies and periods sampled and codify the items for systematic mass analysis. Important steps in this direction have been taken through the application of standardized procedures of textual analysis to such diverse 'process produced' data as folktales, children's readers and newspaper editorials. A remarkable *rapprochement* has occurred between the humanistic traditions of qualitative analysis in linguistic and folklore studies and the hard-headed frequency counting pioneered by Harold Lasswell and his disciples<sup>21</sup> in the study of political communication and mass persuasion. A particularly promising example of cross-national content analysis of cultural products is D. McClelland's *The Achieving Society*.<sup>22</sup> The recent development of electronic computer facilities for content analysis of written documents<sup>23</sup> is certain to have a profound impact on such research, and we can expect accelerated efforts in the near future for the storing and codifying of data for such mass analysis.

Data from observations and descriptions of the institutions and peculiarities of different societies provide the basis for a rich literature of anecdotes and idiosyncratic interpretations, but require detailed evaluation and codification if they are to serve the needs of comparative social science.

The great pioneers in the study of primitive populations did much to standardize the report-taking of travellers and missionaries and to ensure the fullest possible coverage in each description. A number of attempts were made to store and codify the materials from such descriptions. Decisive progress was

<sup>21</sup> The basic texts are H. D. LASSWELL *et al*, *Language of Politics*, New York, G. W. Stewart, 1949; H. D. LASSWELL, D. LERNER and I. de Sola POOL, *The Comparative Study of Symbols*, Stanford, Hoover Institute Series, 1952; B. BERELSON, *Content Analysis in Communication Research*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1952; R. NORTH *et al.*, *Handbook of Content Analysis*, Evanston, Northwestern Univ. Press, 1963. The single most important volume on the trends toward a convergence of textual analysis techniques in linguistics, folklore, anthropology and mass communications research is the one edited by I. de Sola POOL on *Trends in Content Analysis*, Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press, 1959.

<sup>22</sup> D. MCCLELLAND, *The Achieving Society*, Princeton, Van Nostrand, 1961. A curious example of the use of cross-cultural content analysis (jokes, cartoons) in the study of modal personality characteristics is H. HENDIN'S *Suicide and Scandinavia. A Psychoanalytic Study of Culture and Character*, London, Grune and Stratton, 1964.

<sup>23</sup> See P. J. STONE *et al*, 'The General Inquirer: A Computer System of Content Analysis and Retrieval Based on the Sentence as a Unit of Information', *Behavioral Science* 7 (4), Oct. 1962, pp. 484-498, and the chapters in P. J. STONE *et al*, *The General Inquirer*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1967.



not achieved in this direction, however, until Peter Murdock and his colleagues launched the Yale Cross-Cultural Survey in 1937, and later built up the *Human Relations Area Files*.<sup>24</sup> This expanding repository of coded information on a sample of the world's known societies<sup>25</sup> has proved an essential tool in the development of designs and techniques for the analysis of cross-cultural variations.<sup>26</sup>

A large number of universities and research institutions subscribe to copies of the *Files*, and increasingly in recent years scholars have tried their hand at cross-cultural comparisons of this type. The *Files* aim at the fullest possible coverage of a representative sample of all the world's societies and will incorporate information on societies at all levels of development, from pre-agricultural tribes to highly industrialized nation-states. In practice, however, it has proved very difficult to apply the traditional anthropological techniques of data gathering and codification to advanced nation-states, and most of the cross-cultural comparisons have been limited to pre-literate units.<sup>27</sup>

The comparative study of industrializing nation-states grew out of a tradition of systematic observation by travellers, journalists and itinerant scholars: the pioneering analyses of Montesquieu, Tocqueville, Marx, Engels, Ostrogorski, Michels, Bryce and Weber were all strongly influenced by experiences of direct exposure to foreign manners and institutions. Weber's ambitious attempt to build up a conceptual framework for the comparative study of the growth of centralized bureaucracies and mass democracies reflected more than a century of discussion on contrasts and similarities between national developments in Europe and America and between the West and the East. The data for such ventures varied enormously in reliability, precision and coverage, and ranged from fairly well-researched historical and legal evidence, over unevaluated bodies of crude official statistics, to impressionistic accounts of the workings of

<sup>24</sup> G. P. MURDOCK, 'The Cross-Cultural Survey', *American Sociological Review* 5 (3), June 1940, pp. 361-370; cf. F. W. MOORE (ed.), *Readings in Cross-Cultural Methodology*, New Haven, HRAF Press, 1961.

<sup>25</sup> The codes used in classifying information are given in G. P. MURDOCK *et al.*, *An Outline of Cultural Materials*, New Haven, HRAF Press, 4th rev. ed., 1961. An up-to-date listing of the universe and the samples of the world's societies is given in G. P. MURDOCK, *An Outline of World Cultures*, New Haven, HRAF Press, 3rd ed., 1963. Extending the sample and adding a variety of new codings, Robert TEXTOR has subsequently assembled a basic handbook of information on 400 societies: see his *A Cross-Cultural Summary*, *op. cit.* Karl DEUTSCH and Carl-Joachim FRIEDRICH have recently launched a collective exploration of the possibilities of using HRAF data and HRAF techniques in the comparative study of political systems.

<sup>26</sup> See G. P. MURDOCK, *Social Structure*, New York, Macmillan, 1949, and a host of subsequent analyses: cf. O. LEWIS, 'Comparisons in Cultural Anthropology', pp. 259-292 in: W. L. THOMAS, Jr., *Current Anthropology*, Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1956, and W. J. MCEWEN, 'Forms and Problems of Validation in Social Anthropology', *Current Anthropology* 4 (2), 1963, pp. 155-183.

<sup>27</sup> A pioneering attempt to apply HRAF-type techniques to national *polities* rather than societies is A. BANKS and R. TEXTOR, *A Cross-Polity Survey*, *op. cit.*

particular institutions and the 'psychology' of different local populations. Scholars following Weber's path face a serious dilemma. If they decide to continue his work in theory-construction, they will either find it impossible to establish an adequate data basis for their analyses or come under heavy and justified attacks from historians and area specialists for ignorance and distortions and for Procrustean classifications of institutions and processes. On the other hand, if they concentrate their efforts on comparative data gathering and evaluation they soon run into difficulties of conceptual integration and theoretical interpretation.<sup>28</sup>

Shmuel Eisenstadt's gigantic contribution to comparative analysis, *The Political System of Empires*<sup>29</sup>, exemplifies one possible research strategy. He develops an elaborate model of processes of centralization, bureaucratization and debureaucratization, and then seeks to test the consequences against evidence for five pre-bureaucratic societies and twenty-seven historical bureaucratic societies. The problems encountered in such attempts are two-fold: first, are the categories precise enough for effective analysis and are they meaningful across so many different areas of the world and, secondly, does the evidence available allow some measure of consensus among experts on the categorization of concrete instances? To fit so many different cases, Eisenstadt's categories had to leave a considerable margin of imprecision, but this very imprecision makes many of his one-man categorizations of concrete cases highly debatable, despite an extraordinary display of detailed historical erudition.

Reinhard Bendix's volume on *Nation-Building and Citizenship*<sup>30</sup> exemplifies a more cautious approach: a number of theoretical distinctions first set out by Tocqueville and Weber are worked out in greater detail and then illustrated through the analysis of a number of concrete national developments. Barrington Moore's work on the conditions for the emergence of multi-party democracies or mass dictatorships<sup>31</sup> offers a detailed review of the comparative histories of alliance formation among agricultural, commercial and bureaucratic elites in England, France, the United States, China, Japan and India, and demonstrates how it is possible to make use of a variety of concrete data from culturally very

<sup>28</sup> For discussions of the potentialities and the problems of comparative history see M. BLOCH, 'Pour une histoire comparée des sociétés européennes', orig. published in 1928, repr. in *Mélanges historiques*, Paris, S.E.V.P.E.N., 1968, vol. I, pp. 16-40; S. THRUPP, 'The Role of Comparison in the Development of Economic History,' *Journal of Economic History* 17 (4), Dec. 1957; F. REDLICH, 'Toward Comparative Historiography', *Kyklos* 11, 1958, pp. 362-389; and D. GERHARD, *Alte und neue Wege der vergleichenden Geschichtsbetrachtung*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, 1960. S. THRUPP has made a pioneering effort to develop regular exchanges among historians and social scientists interested in cross-national analyses through the organization of the important international journal *Comparative Studies in Society and History*.

<sup>29</sup> S. N. EISENSTADT, *The Political Systems of Empires*, New York, Free Press, 1963.

<sup>30</sup> R. BENDIX, *Nation-Building and Citizenship*, New York, Wiley, 1964.

<sup>31</sup> B. MOORE, *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1966.

different countries for purposes of systematic comparison. Seymour Martin Lipset's early work exemplified an empirical strategy:<sup>52</sup> *Political Man* is essentially the outgrowth of a series of efforts to assemble prima facie comparable data on society and politics for a number of countries. His later contributions seek to achieve a better balance between theory-construction and empirical analysis. His work *The First New Nation* is essentially an attempt to bring Tocqueville's interpretation of the uniqueness of American society up to date through the development of a new analytical framework and through the collation of illustrative quantitative comparisons. Many future comparativists will no doubt continue to pursue such 'mixed' strategies, but substantial progress in this field does not seem likely unless we reach a higher level of differentiation and specialization in research roles: some social scientists will no doubt continue to pursue theoretical refinements, but to meet their demands for evidence we must also encourage the formation of a broad phalanx of experts on a wide range of empirical data across several countries.

To form a basis for detailed comparisons of rates of development within new as well as established nation-states, it is essential to supplement information from historical documents and observers' reports with data from standardized counts and other attempts at systematic social, cultural and political map-making. Only in this way is it possible to approach reliable estimates of changes over time and of within-unit variations in the conditions and sequences of development.

The statisticians of the Western world can look back on more than a century of cooperative efforts to standardize national bookkeeping and census-taking procedures. The great Belgian pioneer, Quetelet, established a network of contacts throughout Europe and, in 1851, took a decisive initiative in launching the International Statistical Congresses. The next generation went further and in 1887 set up the International Statistical Institute: this provided a basis for contacts among experts and administrators of many nations and prepared the ground for the systematic work of comparison and standardization later taken up at the governmental level by the League of Nations, the International Labour Organisation and, during the last two decades, by the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies<sup>53</sup>

<sup>52</sup> S. M. LIPSET, *Political Man*, Garden City, Doubleday, 1960, and *The First New Nation: The United States in Historical and Comparative Perspective*, New York, Basic Books, 1963; cf. also the historically oriented comparisons in S. M. LIPSET and S. ROKKAN, 'Cleavage Structure, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction', in: S. M. LIPSET and S. ROKKAN (eds.), *Party System and Voter Alignments*, New York, Free Press, 1967.

<sup>53</sup> The sheer mass of documentation produced by these efforts is overwhelming. A basic list of references to proposed standards is given in: Statistical Office of the UN., *Directory of International Standards for Statistics*, New York, United Nations, Stat. Ser. M. No. 22, Rev. I, 1960. This, however, gives little or no information on the concrete contents of the standards or on problems of applications. For further details

It took a long time, however, before the impact of these developments was felt throughout the social sciences. The demographers were the first to develop the tools of analysis required in mastering these vast quantities of data, the economists followed suit after the Second World War, but the sociologists have only recently taken up the challenge of the increasing masses of cross-national data. The early fascination with comparative statistics for suicide, homicide and other items of *Moralstatistik* did not herald the advent of a comparative sociology of national development: Durkheim's work was of great methodological significance but was not followed up through broader comparative investigations of processes of change in industrializing and urbanizing nations. It is characteristic that the pioneering comparisons of mobility data published by Pitirim Sorokin in 1927<sup>34</sup> barely caused any reaction in the scholarly world at the time, and was discovered to be a true classic of cross-national research only after the establishment of the Research Committee on Social Stratification and Mobility under the auspices of the International Sociological Association in 1951.<sup>35</sup> The decisive breakthrough toward quantitative comparisons did not in fact occur until the 1950s: economists finally began to come seriously to grips with the possibilities of precise analyses of rates and patterns of growth, sociologists started concerning themselves with comparative measures of processes of structural change, and even students of politics ceased to be exclusively absorbed by single systems and began trying to work out schemes of comparison and to devise ways of testing hypotheses quantitatively.

Two technical developments proved crucial in accelerating these movements toward greater boldness in tackling the problems of cross-national comparison: first, the extraordinary improvements in machinery for the handling of huge data masses and, secondly, the organization in more and more countries of sample survey organizations gathering data on broader ranges of variables than were normally covered in official statistical bookkeeping operations.

The development of the electronic computer has brought about a revolution in comparative research. Tasks of calculation so far judged beyond the reach of even the largest research institute can now be carried out quickly and at moderate cost at a number of academic computer centres. The very existence of these new machines has prompted a number of research organizations to build up extensive data archives on punch-cards or on tape, and several of these now

---

on UN statistical efforts see the chapter by D. N. MCGRANAHAN in: R. L. MERRITT and S. ROKKAN, (eds.), *Comparing Nations*, op. cit.

<sup>34</sup> P. A. SOROKIN, *Social Mobility*, London, Harper, 1927, reprinted at Glencoe, The Free Press, 1959.

<sup>35</sup> S. M. MILLER, 'Comparative Social Mobility', *Current Sociology* 9 (1), 1961, pp. 1-89; D. V. GLASS and R. KÖNIG, *Soziale Schichtung und soziale Mobilität*, Cologne, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1961; and the literature listed in S. ROKKAN et al., *Comparative Survey Analysis*, op. cit. For a full bibliography of efforts of comparative analysis in other fields of sociology see D. C. MARSH, *Comparative Sociology*, op. cit.

cover data from large numbers of countries throughout the world. The need for such data archives has proved most urgent in comparative studies of economic growth, and an impressive number of attempts have been made in recent years to apply complex techniques of computation to cross-national data for a variety of indicators of resources, production, income, distribution, etc.<sup>36</sup> The case for similar data archives has also been effectively demonstrated in a study of world urbanization through the work of Kingsley Davis and his group at the University of California at Berkeley,<sup>37</sup> and more recently also in the study of political modernization by Karl Deutsch and his associates at Yale and later at Harvard.<sup>38</sup>

The sociologists and political scientists developing such plans have of necessity been concerned with broader ranges of cross-national variables than the demographers and the economists: they have not only assembled data from censuses, national accounts, trade statistics, and other governmental bookkeeping operations, but have also tried to accumulate the best available estimates of variations in the spread of education and culture, in the sway of religious, ideological and political movements, and in the exposure of the population to the newer media of communication. UNESCO and such regional organizations as the OECD are doing magnificent work on the evaluation of the comparative statistics of education, and in this field the sociologists and political scientists attempting to build up data programmes can simply take over the country-by-country estimates produced by these organizations. The situation is less encouraging for mass media statistics: here UNESCO has been making valiant efforts to accumulate information, but has had very little opportunity to carry out detailed evaluations and analyses. On cultural, religious, and political variables the international organizations can supply little or nothing: here the social scientist is rather left to his own devices and must glean such data as seem worthy of comparison from whatever national sources he can find. Data on religious memberships, electoral turnout, and party strength can be assembled from official counts for a sizeable number of countries, but to evaluate and interpret such data in any comparative analysis the social scientists will require detailed knowledge of the working of each national system, and here the literature is often deficient.<sup>39</sup> Data on levels of participation, whether cultural, reli-

<sup>36</sup> An excellent source book on such indicators is N. GINSBURG'S *Atlas of Economic Development*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1961; this also includes an example (by B. J. C. BERRY) of one type of correlational analysis now made possible on the basis of such data.

<sup>37</sup> The International Population and Urban Research Program at Berkeley has developed a systematic file of information on all of the world's cities and metropolitan areas of 100,000 inhabitants or more; cf. International Urban Research, *The World's Metropolitan Areas*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1959.

<sup>38</sup> See K. DEUTSCH, 'Toward an Inventory of Basic Trends and Patterns in Comparative and International Politics', *American Political Science Review* 54 (1), 1960, pp. 34-57; B. RUSSETT *et al*, *World Handbook*, *op. cit.*; and R. L. MERRITT and S. ROKKAN (eds.), *Comparing Nations*, *op. cit.*

<sup>39</sup> This is the essential rationale for the plan now under consideration within UNESCO for

gious or political, can only rarely be assembled from regular statistical sources. Here, the principal possibilities are private counting operations (church attendance, statistics of party and union memberships) and *ad hoc* sample surveys. So far, very little has been done to make use of such data in computer programmes for cross-national comparison, but efforts are at least under way to establish a basis for such analyses through the development of archives of raw data from sample surveys for different countries.

The practice of interviewing samples of populations can be traced to several distinct historical roots. One line of development may be traced to the official census: sampling procedures were developed to cut down the cost of censuses of social conditions, particularly studies of poverty, unemployment and sub-standard housing, and at the same time made it possible to gather information in greater detail than in official data gathering operations. Another line of development derives from the election, the public referendum, the plebiscite. 'Straw polls' and opinion soundings served as short cuts to information on the inclinations and preferences of the general public. At first, up to the middle 1930s, there were few points of contact between these two traditions of inquiry, but this changed radically with the emergence of large-scale organizations for the conduct of interview studies, first under commercial auspices, later also within government departments and universities. The mass interview was found to be a flexible instrument of social inquiry and soon proved its usefulness in a wide range of contexts. In fact, it combined at least six hitherto distinct models of social and behavioural data gathering within one unified operation: the census questionnaire, the standardized observation checklist, the informal reportorial conversation, the referendum, the election, and the psychological test. This flexibility proved the great strength of the interview as a research procedure, but at least in the initial phases caused a good deal of confusion and controversy.<sup>40</sup>

a series of *International Guides to Data for Comparative Research*. The first of these, the *International Guide to Electoral Statistics*, is already far advanced: the first volume was published in 1969 by the International Committee for Social Sciences Documentation in cooperation with the International Social Science Council. In the USA, the Social Science Research Council has supported an exploratory study by Walter D. BURNHAM on the possibilities of assembling a central file of historical election data by country for computer processing. The Inter-University Consortium for Political Research at Ann Arbor, Michigan, is currently following up this effort and is building up a large file of census and election data by county to allow ecological trend analyses. For a general discussion of the potentialities of such approaches to the comparative study of political ecology see S. ROKKAN, *Electoral Mobilization, Party Competition and Territorial Integration*, in: J. La PALOMBARA and M. WEINER (eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1966, and his Introduction to S. ROKKAN and J. MEYRIAT (eds.), *International Guide to Electoral Statistics, Vol. I: National Elections in W. Europe*, Paris, Mouton, 1969; cf. also M. DOGAN and S. ROKKAN (eds.), *Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge (Mass.), MIT Press, 1969.

<sup>40</sup> The sizeable body of literature generated by these developments has never been

The late thirties saw a great mushrooming of private organizations for the conduct of interviews within samples of national populations, first in the United States, then in Britain and in France. This movement continued at an accelerated tempo during the years immediately following the end of hostilities in 1944-45. By 1950, all the economically advanced countries of the West, and even some Third World' countries, had seen the establishment of at least one private polling organization in its territory. Most of these were brought into one of the two world networks of polling agencies: Gallup Affiliates or the initially Roper-linked International Research Associates (INRA). These two networks served crucial functions in the internationalization of the polling profession. They spread techniques and standards from country to country, they accumulated experiences in the use of equivalent question formulations and measurement techniques across different countries, they offered facilities for conducting comparative surveys by governmental agencies, business corporations, and even academic scholars.

But this was only the first of three distinctive developments in this field of data gathering: increasingly, governmental agencies developed staffs for conducting sample surveys, and a number of academic institutions were able to set up field organizations of some sort, whether separately or through various joint arrangements.

To get some perspective on these developments we shall have to go back to our distinctions between alternative 'models of data gathering'.

The commercial survey was essentially modelled on the election and the referendum: the very name used to describe field operations of this type, *polls*, rubbed in these origins in attempts at a miniaturization of officially established consultations of the 'people'. The great breakthrough in 1936 was the result of a successful attempt to simulate elections ahead of time. There was sufficient isomorphy between the situation in the interview and the situation in the polling booth to make it safe to predict official results from the established frequencies of responses to the interviewers. But the crucial development occurred afterwards: the commercial surveyors shifted from the election model to the model of the referendum, and claimed to be able to take the 'people's pulse' not only in matters of party strength or candidate choice, but even in matters of public policy. The model of the referendum or the plebiscite was to have a profound

---

systematically analyzed. Among the hundreds of articles and chapters produced in the course of the controversy, these have perhaps proved the more significant: T. HARRISON, 'What is Public Opinion?', *Political Quarterly* 2, 1940, pp. 368-383; H. BLUMER, 'Public Opinion and Public Opinion Polling', *American Sociological Review* 13, 1948, pp. 542-565; H. ARBUTHNOT, Democracy by Snap Judgment, *Listener*, March 4, 1948, pp. 367-368; L. ROGERS, *The Pollsters*, New York, Knopf, 1949; H. SPEIER, 'The Historical Development of Public Opinion', in his: *Social Order and the Risk of War*, New York, Steward, 1952; H. HYMAN, *Survey Design and Analysis*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1955, Chap. VIII; P. LAZARSFELD, 'Public Opinion and the Classical Tradition', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 21, 1957, pp. 39-53.

impact on the style of work in the commercial agencies, not only in their reports to newspapers and radio networks on issues of public policy, but also in their studies in the consumption market, of mass preferences among products.

In the early phase of commercial polling and market research the typical report simply gave for each question the percent of responses one way or the other: so many X, so many Y, so many Z, so many Don't Know. The underlying model of the public was plebiscitarian and equalitarian. The 'pollsters' started out from the basic premise of full-suffrage democracy: 'one citizen, one vote, one value'. They equated votes and other expressions of opinion and attributed the same numerical value to every such expression, whether actively articulated independently of any interview, or elicited only in the interview situation. The sum total of such unit expressions was presented as an estimate of 'public opinion' on the given issue. The aim was clearly not merely elicitation, classification, and enumeration: the essential aim was to establish the 'will of the people' through sample interviews instead of through elections and referenda. To such pioneers as George Gallup and Elmo Roper, the 'poll' was essentially a new technique of democratic control: the interviews helped to bring out the will of the 'inarticulate, unorganized majority of the people' as a countervailing power against the persuasive pressures of the many minority interests.<sup>41</sup>

For years this emphasis on the plebiscite as a model set the commercial practitioners in opposition to the governmental and the academic survey professionals.

A number of government agencies set up survey organizations from the late 1930s onwards to ensure quicker and cheaper data collection in areas that had been poorly covered under the traditional systems of administrative bookkeeping.

The best known and most far-ranging of these was probably the Social Survey set up under the Central Office of Information in London. The operations of these governmental agencies were modelled essentially on the census. They were used to obtain inexpensive estimates of distributions within given populations and were geared to eminently practical tasks of policy guidance.

The academic survey organization also remained true to the census model but added two further elements:

---

<sup>41</sup> The plebiscitarian assumptions of commercial polling have been analysed with great critical skill by the German philosopher Wilhelm HENNIS in *Meinungsforschung und repräsentative Demokratie*, Tübingen, Mohr, 1957. This work is of particular interest as an attempt to bridge the gap between the political theory of representation and democracy and the current controversies about the assumptions underlying the practice of mass interviews. This theme is discussed in a broader perspective of historical sociology in J. HABERMAS, *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*, Neuwied, Luchterhand, 1961. The position of the 'pollsters' has been ably defended by G. SCHMIDT-CHEN, *Die befragte Nation*, Freiburg, Rombach, 1959, and M. KOHN, *Umfragen und Demokratie*, Allensbach, Verlag für Demoskopie, 1959.



- the fixed-category test battery,
- the informal reportorial conversation.

Historically, the test battery grew out of the standardized scholastic examination. By contrast to the single-question approach of the plebiscite-modelled poll, the test-type interview elicited responses to a wide range of items within the same fields of variation, and offered the basis for a variety of summary measures of tendencies, orientations, attitudes, personality syndromes. The techniques of test administration had initially been developed in the classroom and in the study of other 'found' groups of subjects but was, after some experimentation, adjusted to the requirements of the 'doorstep' interview. This development opened up a number of opportunities for innovation, not only in the range and depth of data gathering, but also in the style of statistical refinement. The commercial polls had typically limited themselves to elementary statistical treatments of their data: most of the findings were presented in simple percentage tables. With the introduction of multi-item test batteries, there was a marked increase in the statistical sophistication of survey analysis: the responses collected through interview surveys were not only subject to the typical correlation and factor analytical treatments of the type known from the earlier phase of differential and educational psychology, but also offered opportunities for the development of powerful new techniques better adapted to the qualitative character of the data, such as Guttman scaling, Lazarsfeld's latent structure analysis, and various forms of attribute space analysis.

A major characteristic of the full-blown academic survey operation is its extreme flexibility: it allows the combination of elements from all the models of 'bureaucratic' data gathering and adds another, perhaps still more important, model, the informal conversation among strangers. The Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan made a pioneering contribution to the development of the informal, 'open-ended' interview as a tool for data gathering: there had been an increasing awareness of the artificiality of many of the response categories in the fixed-alternative questions inherited from the census model, and even more so, those taken from the plebiscite model, and more and more elaborate attempts were made to approximate the flow of informal colloquial conversation without jeopardizing the imperative controls of cross-interview comparability. This linked up with a number of parallel developments in the 'case-oriented' behavioural sciences: the therapeutic conversation inherited from the religious practice of confession and perfected in the various schools of psychoanalysis, the counselling interview developed within social work traditions and in educational psychology, the personnel interview developed within management psychology, the informal questioning of informants practised for decades by cultural and social anthropologists in their studies of preliterate and traditional communities. These movements on the data elicitation front were reinforced by concomitant developments on the data categorization - data processing front. The efforts made in linguistics, folklore

and communications research to elaborate techniques for the statistical analysis of the style and content of oral or textual messages helped survey analysts to find ways of coping with 'open-ended' responses and to develop techniques for the extraction of significant dimensions of variation in the flow of messages recorded by the interviewers.

The rapid expansion of the international networks of interview organizations did much to develop comparable procedures for opinion soundings and market studies across several different countries at the time.<sup>42</sup> Only a handful of academic social scientists took an interest in these international developments during the first decade or so, but at least a few imaginative beginnings were made. A pioneer in the use of these new techniques of cross-national research was the American psychologist Hadley Cantril. He showed how this machinery of data gathering could be used to throw light on central problems in the study of international communication: his UNESCO-sponsored study, *How Nations See Each Other*<sup>43</sup>, was the first in a series of attempts to make systematic use of national interview organizations in theory-oriented comparative research. He also pointed out the possibilities of drawing on the rapidly increasing production of interview data for comparative secondary analysis. His voluminous compilation of findings through 1946<sup>44</sup> paved the way for subsequent efforts to assemble not only press releases and reports from the many interview organizations of the world, but also the raw data of their studies as recorded on punched cards or tapes.

The next great wave of internationalization occurred around the second half of the 1950s. These years saw the beginning of the data archiving movement,<sup>45</sup> and witnessed a marked increase of scholarly interest in the international potentialities of the new techniques of data gathering. From the mid-fifties onward, there was a continuous ferment of plans, designs and schemes for cross-cultural and cross-national data gathering and data analysis, and a great many of these generated important bodies of data and led to interesting analytical

---

<sup>42</sup> For a bibliography of these developments see S. ROKKAN *et al*, *Comparative Survey Analysis*, *op. cit.*

<sup>43</sup> W. BUCHANAN and H. CANTRIL, *HOW Nations See Each Other*, Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press, 1953.

<sup>44</sup> H. CANTRIL, M. STRUNK (eds.), *Public Opinion 1935-46*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1951. The *Public Opinion Quarterly* listed 'poll' results from 1940 to 1951 and again from 1961, but the coverage of these listings was not very systematic. The Steinmetz Institute at the University of Amsterdam has collected an important archive of releases and reports from polling organizations, and from 1965 to 1969 published a journal, *Polls*, for the registration of questions and total response distributions from studies carried out all over the world.

<sup>45</sup> The first systematic report was by Y. Lucci and S. ROKKAN, *A Library Center for Survey Research Data*, New York, Columbia Univ. School of Library Services, 1957; cf. the further reports in the special issue on 'Data in Comparative Research', *International Social Science Journal* 16 (1), 1964 and in: S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Data Archives for the Social Sciences*, Paris, Mouton, 1968.

innovations. The great majority of centrally coordinated projects were American in origin. Until well into the 'sixties it was possible to raise funds for such costly academic research enterprises only from **us** agencies and foundations. Any priority listing of such American projects will of necessity be arbitrary, but these seem to me to be most important examples of academically oriented data gathering operations across three or more countries since the early fifties:

The earliest of all co-ordinated survey studies in developing countries was the study covering six Middle Eastern countries initiated by Lazarsfeld at the Columbia University Bureau of Applied Social Research during 1949-51: this was at first presented only in a few internal reports, but was later analysed within a broader theoretical framework by Daniel Lerner.<sup>46</sup> Parallel survey research efforts in the developing countries were pursued by Hadley Cantril, the great pioneer of cross-national polling. He set up an Institute for International Social Research at Princeton, N.J., and with his colleague, Lloyd Free, organized a great number of studies on mass and elite attitudes across the world. The most important of these detailed reports covered the administration of his 'Self-Anchoring Striving Scale' on five continents: in four highly developed countries (USA, Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and Japan), in three very different sorts of Socialist polities (Poland, Yugoslavia and, interestingly, Castroite Cuba) and in seven typically 'developing' countries (Panama, the Philippines, the Dominican Republic, Brazil, Egypt, Nigeria and India).<sup>47</sup>

A number of comparative studies have centred on factors of change and modernization in the developing countries. David McClelland<sup>48</sup> was able to replicate his 'n-Achievement' test on different samples in Brazil, Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Poland and Turkey, and developed an intriguing theory of the personality syndromes most likely to produce entrepreneurial talents in developing countries. Alex Inkeles administered a 119-item test of 'attitudinal modernity' to matched 'common man' samples in Argentina, Chile, India, Israel and Nigeria,<sup>49</sup> and Sidney Verba was able to finance a study of attitudes to social and political changes in two of these countries, India and Nigeria, for a comparative analysis with corresponding data for Japan and the United States (Mexico had been included in the original scheme but had to be dropped in the wake of project Camelot). A major comparative study of attitudes to economic growth is currently (1970) in the planning stage at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology: this will be directed by Frederick Frey.

A number of psychologists found it tempting to replicate their tests and techniques in foreign countries. A pioneer in the field of psychological mea-

<sup>46</sup> D. LERNER, *The Passing of Traditional Society*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1958.

<sup>47</sup> H. CANTRIL, *The Pattern of Human Concerns*, New Brunswick, Rutgers Univ. Press, 1965.

<sup>48</sup> D. C. MCCLELLAND, *The Achieving Society*, *op. cit.*

<sup>49</sup> First report: D. H. SMITH and A. INKELES, 'The OM Scale: A Comparative Social Psychological Measure of Individual Modernity', *Sociometry* 25 (4), Dec. 1966, pp. 353-377.

surement, Charles Osgood, succeeded in persuading colleagues in nearly twenty language communities to use his Semantic Differential Technique.<sup>50</sup> The Andersons were able to replicate their 'Incomplete Story' test in some ten countries to explore differences in student-teacher relations in democratic vs. authoritarian environments, and Lambert and Klineberg sampled children of different ages in nine countries to test hypotheses on the growth of stereotypes of foreign peoples.<sup>51</sup>

Among anthropologists, the Whitings took the lead in the development of standardized schedules for the recording of information about child-rearing practices, and organized an important six-culture data gathering operation much on the same lines as the typical cross-national survey.<sup>52</sup>

None of these efforts attracted quite as much scholarly attention as the attempts made within political sociology and behavioural political science to accumulate new data and generate new insights through cross-national survey operations. The best known and in many ways the most controversial and stimulating of these was the five-country study reported on by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba in *The Civic Culture*, a comparative survey of cross-sections of the adult populations of the United States, Great Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and Mexico.<sup>53</sup> A number of political sociologists devoted to cross-national comparisons preferred to work with secondary data for a wider range of countries: Seymour Martin Lipset, William Kornhauser and Robert Alford relied on data from independently conducted commercial polls and surveys and tried to place the findings in broader perspectives of history and theory.<sup>54</sup> Sociologists such as Daniel Lerner<sup>55</sup> and political scientists such as Karl Deutsch<sup>56</sup> were able to organize extensive studies of elite attitudes in Western Europe and sought to link up evidence from such top-level interviews with secondary evidence from mass surveys. The active team of electoral ana-

<sup>50</sup> See C. OSGOOD, 'On the Strategy of Cross-National Research into Subjective Culture', *Social Science Information* 6 (I), Feb. 1967, pp. 6-37.

<sup>51</sup> See H. H. and G. L. ANDERSON, 'Image of the Teacher by Adolescent Children in Seven Countries', *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, July 1961, pp. 481-482; W. E. LAMBERT and O. KLINEBERG, *Children's Views of Foreign Peoples: A Cross-National Study*, New York, Appleton, 1966.

<sup>52</sup> B. B. WHITING (ed.), *Six Cultures: Studies of Child Rearing*, New York, Wiley, 1963; J. W. M. WHITING *et al*, *Field Guide for the Study of Socialization*, New York Wiley, 1966.

<sup>53</sup> G. A. ALMOND and S. VERBA, *The Civic Culture*, Princeton, Princeton Univ. Press, 1963.

<sup>54</sup> S. M. LIPSET, *Political Man*, *op. cit.*; W. KORNHAUSER, *The Politics of Mass Society*, New York, Free Press, 1959; R. ALFORD, *Party and Society*, Chicago, Rand McNally, 1963.

<sup>55</sup> D. LERNER, 'Interviewing European Elites', *Polls* 2 (I), 1966, pp. 1-7.

<sup>56</sup> K. W. DEUTSCH, *France, Germany and the Western Alliance. A Study of Elite Attitudes on European Integration and World Politics*, New York, Scribners, 1967; R. L. MERRITT and D. J. PUCHALA (eds.), *Western European Perspectives on International Affairs: Public Opinion Studies and Evaluations*, New York, Praeger, 1968.

lysts at the Survey Research Center moved into Europe country by country, and organized local as well as nationwide surveys on lines comparable to the very successful ones carried out in the United States.<sup>57</sup> Finally, Philip and Betty Jacob were able to finance the organization of an elaborate four-nation study of 'values in local government': this project covers the USA, Poland, Yugoslavia and India and has generated an impressive array of memoranda, conference reports and initial analyses.<sup>58</sup>

### III. The Decisive Challenge: The Construction of Typologies of 'Macro' Settings for Variations in Human Behaviour

It is easy to be overawed by this bustle of initiative, and it is equally tempting to puncture the pretensions of some of these studies. There can be little doubt of the value of these many projects as training exercises. They do help to widen the horizons of social scientists and they serve essential heuristic functions in generating new insights into new hypotheses about each of the societies covered. Nor can there be much doubt as to the value of a number of these projects as data gathering enterprises. Without such initiatives our stock of information on each society would be appreciably poorer. But how about the payoff for *social science theory*? Have any of these projects of comparative inquiry led to distinct advances in the formulation of coherent sets of propositions concerning the sources of variations in social structures and human behaviours?

Thus far in this account we have only incidentally touched upon issues of social science theory: we have presented an outline of the hierarchies of variations studied through cross-cultural and cross-national comparisons, and have described developments within three distinct traditions of comparative research. The decision to treat these matters of methodology and research organization at such length was essentially motivated by editorial considerations: our aim was to add a cross-disciplinary perspective to the presentations in the longer chapters devoted to the individual social sciences in the first part of this volume. Our discussion of the hierarchies of variations and our account of the different styles of comparative research cuts across most of the fields covered in this volume: for this very reason there is very little overlap with any of the disciplinary chapters. There is bound to be much more overlap, however, in any account of advances in social science theory. Several of the disciplinary chap-

---

<sup>57</sup> S. ROKKAN and A. CAMPBELL, 'Citizen Participation . . .', *op. cit.*; A. CAMPBELL and H. VALEN, 'Party Identification in Norway and the United States', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 25, 1961, pp. 505-525; P. E. CONVERSE and G. DUPEUX, 'De Gaulle et Eisenhower', *Revue française de science politique* 12 (1), March 1962, pp. 54-92.

<sup>58</sup> A. PRZEWORSKI and H. TEUNE, 'Equivalence in Cross-National Research', *Public Opinion Quarterly* 30 (4), 1966, pp. 551-568.

ters deal extensively with styles of theorizing and analyze the impact of comparative cross-cultural and cross-national studies on the development of conceptual frameworks and the construction of models of explanation. Thus Paul Lazarsfeld reviews developments in the field of macro-sociology and stresses the importance of systematic comparisons for the codification of propositions and 'theory sketches' at the level of entire national societies. William Mackenzie in his chapter on trends in political science gives pride of place to the tradition of systematic cross-polity comparison: the style pioneered poetically by Herodotus and philosophically by Aristotle and renewed with such vigour two millennia later by Montesquieu and Tocqueville. In the context of this collective volume, it would therefore make little sense to attempt a broad review of the implications of comparative research for the development of social science theory. Instead, we propose to direct our attention to one single, central set of issues in the development of a world-wide science of Man and Society: the possibilities of translating 'grand theory' into empirically workable *typologies of macro-settings* for variations in human behaviour, and the consequences of such typologies for decisions on the cultural and the geographical range of comparisons at the level of communities, households and individuals.

These issues cut across all the disciplines of the human and the social sciences: they are of central importance in the disciplines devoted to the study of structures of interaction among human beings. Much of the literature on comparative anthropology focuses on the merits of alternative typologies and on the possibilities of establishing regional ranges for cross-societal comparisons.<sup>59</sup> The argument opposing anthropologists and economists over the analysis and interpretation of data on production, manpower and barter in preliterate societies bears on similar issues: how far is it meaningful to 'stretch' models developed at one end of the continuum to cover the twilight zones of part-monetized, part-mobilized communities in developing countries? Similar controversies have arisen in the wake of the eager attempts of sociologists and political scientists to introduce their techniques and styles of analysis into the new nations of the 'Third World': anthropologists and other area specialists have strenuously opposed such efforts to establish a data basis for comparisons across societies differing so fundamentally in structure and in ethos. The attacks against the universalist assumptions underlying Murdock's statistical correlations for samples of the world's societies have their counterpart in the criticisms levelled by anthropologists and historians against such attempts at world-wide data archiving as Karl Deutsch's, and at such universal models of socio-cultural-political development as those sketched by Talcott Parsons among sociologists and by Gabriel Almond, Lucian Pye and their partners in the comparative politics movement.

The extremes in this controversy are easily stated: at the one pole of opposition, all societies, past, present or future, constitute units of potential compari-

<sup>59</sup> See O. LEWIS, 'Comparisons in Cultural Anthropology', *op. cit.*

son and ought eventually to be subjected to tests against unified models of universal hypothetico-deductive explanation; at the other pole, all societies are culturally and historically unique and defy understanding through comparisons with others.

The Murdock school comes closest to the universalist extreme: they want to make sure that all known variants get a chance to be represented in the sample and see few if any direct barriers to meaningful comparisons across the major regions of the world. To this school, the diffusion of cultural characteristics and the sharing of historical experiences constitute so many disturbing elements in the design of the sample of societies, and do not constitute criteria for the limitation of comparisons. The protracted controversy over what has come to be known as 'Galton's problem' tells us a great deal about the ways in which differences in intellectual styles affect the organization of comparative research. The English anthropologist Edward Tylor presented the first 'cross-cultural' table of associated characteristics for a sample of societies in a famous lecture in 1889, and was attacked by the statistician Galton for failing to consider possibilities of cultural diffusion. Tylor had set up a 2 \* 2 table to test the association between the traits 'in-law avoidance' and 'patrilocal residence', but had included in his count of cases a number of societies which were geographically and culturally closely related and might have derived the given combination of traits from a common source.<sup>60</sup> Tylor's followers have heeded this warning and have tried their best to weed out of their samples societies likely to be interpreted as so many 'duplicate copies of the same original', to use Galton's phrase.<sup>61</sup> But this is hardly a lasting strategy in a world constantly shrinking through the diffusion of technologies and ideas and through the accelerated sharing of historical experiences. The Murdock strategy would be eminently applicable in a world of isolated societies and local religions, but runs into a variety of technical, logical and statistical difficulties in a world of proselytizing religions and ideologies, of constantly expanding networks of communication, exchange and organization.

Comparative sociologists such as Shmuel Eisenstadt, Reinhard Bendix, Seymour Martin Lipset, Barrington Moore and Talcott Parsons, and comparative political analysts such as Gabriel Almond, Karl Deutsch, Samuel Huntington, Robert Holt and John Turner have deliberately opted for the alternative solution: to build the communication - diffusion - innovation variables directly into their models and to focus their comparative analyses on units developed through the merger of smaller societies of the type studied by anthropologists. Jack Goody and Ian Watt have epigrammatically identified anthropology as the

<sup>60</sup> E. B. TYLOR, 'On a Method of Investigating the Development of Institutions', *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 28, 1889, pp. 245-280.

<sup>61</sup> See R. NAROLL, 'Two Solutions to Galton's Problem', in: F. W. MOORE (ed.), *Readings in Cross-Cultural Methodology*, New Haven, HRAF Press, 1961, and *Data Quality Control: A New Research Technique*, Glencoe, Free Press, 1962.

science of man as a talking animal and sociology as the science of man as a writing animal:<sup>62</sup> this is the crux of the division between the comparisons of isolated societies in the Tylor-Murdock style and comparisons of empires and nation-states by the followers of Montesquieu, Tocqueville and Weber. The introduction of written communication extends the possibilities of control over space and time and alters the character of the social structure. Talcott Parsons has stressed this 'cybernetic' interpretation in his recent statement on the comparative history of societies. His wide-ranging account runs from the socially-culturally-politically least differentiated preliterate societies, over the 'ideographically' literate early empires and the alphabetized 'seed-bed' societies of Israel and Greece, to the advanced nation-states of the modern age.<sup>63</sup> Such sweeping interpretive statements may at times take on the character of exercises in the philosophy of history but do point to important tasks of detailed comparison.

The best documented historical comparisons have focused on limited ranges of cases or on shorter spans of time: on the conditions for the formation of centralized bureaucracies and differentiated national polities and on the stages and sequences of integration and consolidation, stagnation and decline.

These studies differ markedly in their strategies. We may conveniently distinguish three styles:

- analyses focused on the identification of *one type of polity* and on the construction of a paradigm for the comparison of all historical cases close to this type, wherever they may have occurred in time or space;
- comparisons of pairs or multiples of *leading or innovating polities* across all world regions over roughly the same span of time;
- comparisons of all polities within *one culturally-historically homogeneous region* of the world.

Shmuel Eisenstadt's gigantic work on the emergence and decline of bureaucratic empires<sup>64</sup> offers an excellent example of comparisons of the first type. Nothing of similar scope and analytical depth has as yet been attempted for the other major type of cross-community organization for resource mobilization and territorial control: the nation-state.

Karl Deutsch has given us a suggestive cybernetic model of nation-building processes but has applied it to only a few empirical cases. His pioneering work on *Nationalism and Social Communication* limited its quantitative comparisons to four countries,<sup>65</sup> and the data bank built up by him for analyses of variations

<sup>62</sup> J. GOODY and I. WATT, 'The Consequences of Literacy', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5, 1963, pp. 304-345.

<sup>63</sup> T. PARSONS, *Societies: Comparative and Evolutionary Perspectives*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1967, and *The System of Modern Societies*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, 1970.

<sup>64</sup> S. N. EISENSTADT, *The Political Systems of Empires*, *op. cit.*

<sup>65</sup> K. W. DEUTSCH, *Nationalism and Social Communication*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1953, rev. ed. 1966.



among nation-states does not cover sufficiently long spans of time to allow the testing of developmental models.<sup>66</sup> Perhaps his greatest contribution lies in his effort to codify procedures for the establishment of indicators of variation in the rates of mobilization within the actual or potential territories of nation-states:<sup>67</sup> this work has inspired a variety of attempts at empirical testing and has acted as a springboard for further theorizing.<sup>68</sup>

The Deutsch models fired the imagination of a number of scholars, but they were limited to only one of the many sets of processes inherent in the formation of national political communities: they focused on variables explaining the rates of incorporation of underlying local populations at different physical and/or cultural distances from the national centre, and gave much less attention to variations over time in the political or administrative measures of national standardization and consolidation taken at the territorial centres, or to the dimensions of elite conflicts over such policies. In Deutsch's work with Weilenmann on the formation of the Swiss polity,<sup>69</sup> there are intriguing pointers toward the construction of a model of variations in the processes of alliance formation at the national centre, but the implications of this style of analysis remain to be worked out for other cases of multicultural nation-building such as the Dutch, Belgian, Canadian, and Lebanese.

The paradigm developed in successive steps within the Almond-Pye Committee on Comparative Politics<sup>70</sup> offers a better balance between 'state forma-

<sup>66</sup> The revised edition of the RUSSETT *et al.*, *World Handbook* will however include several 20-30 year time series for the advanced countries: this is scheduled to be published in 1971.

<sup>67</sup> K. W. DEUTSCH, 'Social Mobilization and Political Development', *American Political Science Review* 65 (3), Sept. 1961, pp. 493-514.

<sup>68</sup> See S. ROKKAN and H. VALEN, 'The Mobilization of the Periphery', in: S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Approaches to the Study of Political Participation*, Bergen, Michelsen Institute, 1962; S. ROKKAN, 'Electoral Mobilization, Party Competition and National Integration', in: J. La PALOMBARA and M. WEINER (eds.), *Political Parties and Political Development*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1966; P. NETTL, *Political Mobilization*, London, Faber, 1967; and S. M. LIPSET and S. ROKKAN (eds.), *Party Systems and Voter Alignments*, *op. cit.*

<sup>69</sup> See K. W. DEUTSCH and H. WEELENMANN, 'The Swiss City Canton: A Political Invention', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 7 (4), 1965, pp. 393-408, and the forthcoming volume by the same authors, *United for Diversity: The Political Integration of Switzerland*.

<sup>70</sup> The initial formulations appeared in G. ALMOND and J. COLEMAN (eds.), *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1960. For subsequent stages in the elaboration see the six volumes of the series *Studies in Political Development*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1963-1966, and the following theoretical presentations: G. ALMOND, 'A Developmental Approach to Political Systems', *World Politics* 17, 1965, pp. 183-214; L. W. PYE, 'The Concept of Political Development', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 358, 1965, pp. 1-114; G. ALMOND and L. B. POWELL, *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*, Boston, Little Brown, 1966; and L. W. PYE, 'Political Systems and Political Development', in: S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Comparative Research across Cultures*

tion' variables describing processes at the centre of each system, and 'nation-building' variables accounting for processes of change in the underlying territorial populations. The Almond-Pye scheme posits six crises of development. These define sets of challenges, decision points or policy tasks in the path of any central elite or counter-elite endeavouring to consolidate a national territorial community. This amounts to a proposal to study all historically given nation-states within one conceptual grid, whether old-established or newly constituted, whether in Europe, European settler areas overseas, in Asia or in Africa. The aim is worldwide comparative analysis: the paradigm is a tool in the ordering of data on the sequences of decisions and reactions leading to the formation of nation-states at different levels of cultural consolidation, political mobilization and organizational capacity.

Three of the six crises arise out of conflicts in the extension and differentiation of the administrative apparatus of the nation-state:

- the *penetration* crisis - the crucial initial challenge of the establishment of a co-ordinated network of territorial administrative agents independent of local power resources and responsive to directives from the central decision-making organs;
- the *integration* crisis - clashes over the establishment of allocation rules for the equalization of the shares of administrative offices, benefits and resources among all the culturally-territorially-politically distinct segments and sectors of the national community;
- the *distribution* crisis - conflicts over the expansion of the administrative apparatus of the nation-state through the organisation of services and the imposition of control measures for the equalization of economic conditions between the different strata of the population and between localities differing in their resources and levels of production.

The other three crises arise out of conflicts between elites and counter-elites in the definition and differentiation of the territorial population:

- the *identity* crisis - the crucial initial challenge in the establishment and extension of a common culture and the development of media and agencies for the socialization of future citizens into this community of shared codes, values, memories and symbols;
- the *legitimacy* crisis - clashes over the establishment of central structures of political communication, consultation and representation commanding the loyalty and confidence of significant sections of the national population and ensuring regular conformity to rules and regulations issued by the agencies authorized by the system;

---

and Nations, Paris, Mouton, 1968. Manuscripts of five draft chapters toward the forthcoming collective volume on *Crises of Political Development* were in circulation in 1966; the volume is due to be published in 1970.

- the *participation* crisis - the conflict over the extension of rights of consultation and representation to all strata of the territorial population and over the protection of rights of association, demonstration and opposition.

The paradigm does not posit any fixed sequence in the solution of the six crises; on the contrary, the purpose of the scheme is to pinpoint variations in the sequences of challenges, policy conflicts and full-scale crises among historically given polities and to generate hypotheses concerning the conditions for the emergence of such variations in processes of nation-building. Unfortunately, little concrete work has been done on the operationalization of this set of general concepts or on the classification of historical sequences of conflicts and decisions within this framework. Characteristically, most of the examples used in the presentation and discussion of the scheme have been taken from the brief histories of the nation-states emerging from colonial status following World War II.

Indeed, the decisive intellectual motivation for the development of the scheme was the urge for some ordering and codification of the insights accumulated in the initial study of these new states. There was no similar attempt to bring order into the wealth of historical information at hand on the already functioning nation-states in Europe and the European settler areas. There is little doubt that the scheme can prove useful in the comparative study of these older nation-states, but the concrete experience of operationalization, classification and interpretation has not yet been made.<sup>71</sup>

Whatever the results of such concrete tests, it is clear that this paradigm of crises does not in itself constitute a model for the explanation of variations in the outcomes of nation-building processes. The paradigm helps to order the information about each bundle of processes but has not been built into a body of propositions concerning the consequences of varying sequences of crises and of varying alignments of elites and underlying populations in the solution of the crises.

This has been a field of great intellectual excitement during recent years. A number of sociologists and political scientists have tried to develop models for the explanation of variations in the choice of elite strategies in the building of national communities and have sought to derive propositions concerning the consequences of different alliance strategies for the further development of each system.

We may conveniently distinguish two styles of macro-comparisons along these lines:

- *large-nation comparisons* across *contrasting* cultural areas;
- comparisons of *all units*, smaller as well as larger, within *one* cultural area.

---

<sup>71</sup> For an initial discussion of a scheme of operationalization see S. ROKKAN, 'Models and Methods in the Comparative Study of Nation-Building', *Acta Sociologica* 12 (2), 1969, pp. 53-73.

Reinhard Bendix focuses his work on *Nation-Building and Citizenship* on the growth of territorial systems of public authority in four contrasting national communities: Germany and Russia, India and Japan. Samuel Huntington seeks to define the 'fusion of functions' and 'division of powers' characteristic of the United States through an analysis of the contrasting developments in England and France.<sup>72</sup> In both cases the explanatory variables are sought in the processes of interaction, alliance and conflict among the elites controlling the principal resources of social, economic and/or cultural power in each population; the dependent variables are characteristics of the resultant structures of administrative and political institutions. In another set of 'leader-nation' comparisons, by the political scientists Robert Holt and John Turner,<sup>73</sup> these administrative-political variables in their turn offer a basis for the explanation of contrasts in the timing of the take-off to economic growth: the early industrializers in each cultural context, England and Japan, are systematically compared and contrasted with the two later industrializers, France and China, in an effort to test propositions concerning the consequences of political centralization for the initiation and spread of economic innovations.

This theme, the interlinkages between processes of economic growth and processes of political-constitutional change, is equally central in Barrington Moore's pioneering analysis of the conditions for the rise of democratic opposition politics vs. monolithic dictatorships in the leading states of the modern world.<sup>74</sup>

Moore distinguishes three 'paths to the modern age': the *democratic and capitalist*, the *fascist* and the *communist*, and seeks to compare the histories of the leading nations which followed each of these paths in Europe, America and Asia. He compares the three highly divergent cases of capitalist democracy in the West, England, France and the United States of America, with the one nation which may still follow this path in Asia: India. He then compares two nations which, at least for a period in their history, chose the fascist route to modernization: Germany in Europe and Japan in Asia. Finally, he compares the two giant leaders of the communist nations: Russia and China. These comparisons are linked through a unifying model of alliances and oppositions among four sets of actors: the central bureaucracy, the commercial and the industrial bourgeoisie, the larger landowners and the underlying peasant population. The logic of this analysis is very simple but its implications farreaching: once an alliance or an opposition has established itself through a revolution or through a slower process of interaction, the total political system tends to assume a definite style which will limit options for future decisionmakers. This emphasis

<sup>72</sup> S. HUNTINGTON, 'Political Modernization: America vs. Europe', *World Politics* 18 (3), 1966, pp. 378-414.

<sup>73</sup> R. HOLT and J. TURNER, *The Political Basis of Economic Development*, Princeton, Van Nostrand, 1966.

<sup>74</sup> B. MOORE, *The Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, *op. cit.*

on irreversibilities in the 'typing' of nation-states through early alliances and oppositions has significant consequences for comparative cross-national research: we shall spell this out further below in our discussion of the Lipset-Rokkan model for the explanation of variations among party systems. The great strength of Moore's analysis lies in its discussion of the consequences of alternative alliances and oppositions among the controllers of different types of power resources: the alliance of the landed aristocracy and the urban bourgeoisie *against* the monarchy in England, *through* the monarchy in France, the alliance of Northern capitalists and Western farmers against Southern plantation owners in the United States, the alliance of landowners and royal administrators in Prussia and in Japan, the weaknesses of all alliances between economic power-holders and 'agrarian bureaucracies' in Russia and China. The emphasis throughout is on strategies for the acquiring of maximum power resources and for the organization of countervailing checks. At least in the core model of explanation, there is very little concern for cultural variables influencing strategies and outcomes: no discussion of the role of linguistic loyalties as a factor in decisions on alliance or opposition, no mention of churches and sects as possible resources for the mobilization of support or protest. This may well be justified in a parsimonious model of explanation for just those eight countries, but surely limits the scope of the analysis too rigidly. Moore argues that his model does not require testing beyond these leading countries: the crucial political innovations occurred in these larger units and any further comparison of developments in the smaller countries would help to account for processes of diffusion and adaptation only:

This study concentrates on certain important stages in a prolonged social process which has worked itself out in several countries. As part of this process new social arrangements have grown up by violence or in other ways which have made certain countries political leaders at different points in time during the first half of the twentieth century. The focus of interest is on innovation that has led to political power, not on the spread and reception of institutions that have been hammered out elsewhere, except where they have led to significant power in world politics. The fact that smaller countries depend economically and politically on big and powerful ones means that the decisive causes of their politics lie outside their own boundaries. It also means that their political problems are not really comparable to those of larger countries. Therefore a general statement about the historical preconditions of democracy or authoritarianism covering small countries as well as large would very likely be so broad as to be abstractly platitudinous.<sup>75</sup>

These arguments for the concentration of analytical efforts on leader nations, on systems wielding 'significant power in world politics', raise intriguing issues of research strategy. First of all, what intellectual reasons are there for restricting the endeavours of comparativists to the analysis of conflict and innovation in the major power centres? It would not seem difficult to make as good a case for concerted research on processes of diffusion and reception:

---

<sup>75</sup> B. MOORE, *op cit.*, pp. XII-XIII.

after all, most of the units open to comparative study are 'follower' nations rather than leaders. Secondly, political innovation surely cannot be treated as a function of size alone. Two small polities, Greece and Israel, generated the greatest innovations of the ancient world. In the modern world, small polities such as Iceland, Switzerland, the Netherlands and Sweden have fostered institutional innovations without any direct counterpart in the larger leader units. Talcott Parsons, in his theoretical statement on differentiations among modern societies, has gone so far as to assert that innovations have been more likely to occur in isolated units at the peripheries of major power systems: the Italian city states, the Dutch provinces and the English monarchy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries offered 'sanctuaries in which new developments could mature before having to encounter the more severe tests of broader institutionalization'.<sup>76</sup>

Whatever the merits of this argument, the smaller nations constitute worthy objects of comparative study: they have managed to survive a world dominated by larger and stronger units; they have developed their own distinctive institutions; there are enough of them to allow detailed studies of variations along several different dimensions. Whether it will prove fruitful to apply the models used for the larger nations and world powers to all these smaller units remains doubtful, even if we disregard the 'micro-states' currently studied by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research.<sup>77</sup> In our comparative analysis of the development of party systems, Seymour Martin Lipset and I have fitted sixteen European systems, eleven smaller and five larger ones, into the same core model of explanation,<sup>78</sup> but this does not necessarily succeed for other dependent variables.

In fact, we have become convinced that a good case can be made for Moore's rejection of small-polity comparisons *if they cut across major cultural areas of the world*: 'leader' nations can be meaningfully compared independently of the larger cultural contexts, but smaller units tend to be so heavily dependent on their surroundings that it will be more fruitful to compare them area by area rather than indiscriminately across continents. This certainly goes for comparisons of political and religious institutions, organizations and behaviours, but would also seem to be true for other elements of social structure: ecological configurations, social and economic stratification, educational institutions and achievements. Our comparisons of democratization processes and party-political development in Western Europe suggest that the smaller

<sup>76</sup> T. PARSONS, *The System of Modern Societies*, *op. cit.*

<sup>77</sup> UNITAR, *The Status and Problems of Very Small States and Territories*, New York, UNITAR, 1967, mimeo.

<sup>78</sup> S. M. LIPSET and S. ROKKAN, 'Cleavage Structures, Party Systems and Voter Alignments: An Introduction', in: *Party System and Voter Alignments*, *op. cit.* For further amplification see S. ROKKAN, 'The Structuring of Mass Politics in the Smaller European Democracies', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 10 (2), 1968, pp. 173-210, and *Citizens, Elections, Parties*, New York, D. McKay, 1970.

units are more likely to become structured along cultural dimensions than the larger ones: linguistic/ethnic boundaries cut across Belgium, Switzerland and Finland and have deeply affected the internal politics of Ireland, Denmark and Norway; conflicts over religious identities have found distinctive institutional expressions in the Low Countries, in Switzerland and in Austria. Similar lines of cleavage can of course be traced within the larger countries as well, but they have not so heavily influenced the structuring of institutions and organizations within the national community. One of the hypotheses we hope to substantiate in our current study of the Smaller European Democracies<sup>79</sup> is that the larger nations have commanded greater resources for coping with such forces of cultural divisiveness: the weight of the centralizing standardization machineries has tended to be heavier and the willingness to accept and to institutionalize cultural distinctiveness has been less pronounced than in the smaller units.

This would argue strongly for limiting comparisons of the inner structure of smaller units to clusters of national communities grown out of the same historical experiences of cultural conflict and integration: the polities which emerged out of the Western Roman Empire and the clashes between secular rulers and the Roman Catholic Church, the polities which emerged from the Eastern Roman Empire and the Orthodox Church, the polities of the Moslem world, the polities which grew out the partition of the Spanish and the Portuguese Empires in the Americas, and so on. This would be tantamount to acceptance of Galton's point in his critique of Tylor: the smaller units should not enter the statistical tables indiscriminately but be grouped by areas of cultural communality. This is the third of the strategies distinguished at the beginning of this section: the comparative analysis of dimensions of variation among polities within one culturally-historically homogeneous region. We shall conclude our review of styles of macro-comparison by a brief account of one such attempt at within-region analysis.

The Lipset-Rokkan model of variations in party systems<sup>80</sup> is strictly limited to the set of polities that grew out of the cultural clashes of the Renaissance and Reformation and established their structural characteristics under the joint impact of the Democratic Revolution in France and the Industrial Revolution in England. The task set for the model is also strictly limited. Its purpose is to specify, with a maximum of parsimony, the variables needed to account for the

<sup>79</sup> On this project, see V. R. LORWIN, 'Historians and Other Social Scientists: The Comparative Analysis of Nation-Building in Western Societies,' in: S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Comparative Research across Cultures and Nations*, *op. cit.* The 'SED' project covers the five Nordic countries, the three Benelux countries, Ireland, Switzerland and Austria. Most of the analyses undertaken compare these countries among each other, but on occasion attempts are made to compare the 'smaller' ones (of which two are 'micro' states, Iceland and Luxembourg, while two are medium sized by European standards: Belgium and the Netherlands) with the four larger democracies, Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy, and sometimes even with 'polycephalic' Spain.

<sup>80</sup> S. M. LIPSET and S. ROKKAN, *op. cit.*

observed variations in full suffrage party systems among the countries initially delimited.

The purpose is *not* to explain the emergence of one or the other national party system, but to identify the crucial dimensions of cross-polity variation that account for the presence or absence of different party-political alternatives during the elections following the introduction of universal manhood suffrage.

This is done in three steps:

- first a set of fundamental dimensions of nation-building are identified and the corresponding sequences of elite options are spelt out;
- secondly, a set of propositions is generated concerning the consequences of the decisions at each option point for the formation of lasting electoral party fronts;
- thirdly, these propositions are tested against the historically given party alternatives and each deviant case is discussed in some detail.

The model posits four initial dimensions of nation-building and four corresponding 'critical option points' for the national elites':

*Cultural dimensions:*

I. Centre - periphery

II. State - Church

*Corresponding option points:*

One standardized national language or several?

Establishment of national Church  
vs. alliance with a supranational Church  
vs. establishment of competing secular agencies

*Economic dimensions:*

III. Urban - rural

IV. Owner - worker

Protection of urban vs. rural products against foreign competition: the tariff issue.

Protection of rights of property vs. equalization of economic conditions through union and/or state action.

This listing of dimensions and options could of course be used in studies of *any* nation-state, whether European, American, Asian or African, but this would not of itself make for theoretically fruitful comparisons: just as in the case of the Almond-Pye paradigm the initially posited dimensions of variability must be linked up with each other and with an explicitly stated set of dependent variables in a series of potentially testable propositions. Thus far we have been able to formulate such a set of propositions for one set of dependent variables for sixteen countries of Western Europe. Other scholars are at work on similar



exercises in model-building for Latin America, but this work has not yet advanced far enough to yield definite results.<sup>81</sup> One very good reason is that the range of dependent variables in the model is much broader and the variables themselves are not as easy to operationalize.

These attempts at codification and empirical testing not only promise further advances in the comparative study of nation-building processes, but are bound to have an impact on further work with data at the micro-level of each political system. In fact, we were directly motivated to develop our model for the explanation of the European party systems by the difficulties encountered in attempts to interpret cross-national data on mass reactions to politics in different countries of the West. Seymour Martin Lipset and his colleague Juan Linz had made a major effort in the mid-fifties to collate data from many countries on the political preferences of a variety of occupations and professions, but found it extremely difficult to compare information at this level because of the variations in the political alternatives offered the voters in the different countries.<sup>82</sup> The Lipset-Rokkan model represented a response to the challenge of this earlier effort: it served to specify the dimensions of the dependent variables in comparative studies of voting behaviour, and made it possible to group countries by the extent of similarity of alternatives and to order parties by their degree of national distinctiveness. What makes this operation so intriguing is that it has opened up a new perspective on the interaction of micro- and macro-variations in political systems. By focusing with such determination on the macro-level, the *Party Systems* volume has in fact helped to bring about a reversal in the strategies of comparison. Instead of proceeding as though socio-cultural distinctions determined political behaviour through some process of direct translation, the new emphasis is on the parties as agencies of mass mobilization and on the socio-cultural divisions within the electorates as so many openings for or barriers against efforts of mobilization. In this model the null hypothesis would be that each party succeeds equally well in all divisions of the electorate: the structure of departures from these average mobilization successes would then define the given party system. This implies a fundamental change in the direction of analysis. Instead of seeking to establish more and more multivariate regularities in the determination of micro-behaviours, we resolutely start out with the parties and use the micro-data to characterize the macro-alternatives in each system. This strategy was elucidated in some detail at a recent conference organized by the Committee on Political Sociology of the International Sociological Association. Richard Rose and Derek Urwin presented a plan for the use of data from sample surveys from 12-15 countries

---

<sup>81</sup> O. CORNBLET *et al.*, 'A Model for Political Change in Latin America', *Social Science Information* 7 (2), 1968, pp. 13-48.

<sup>82</sup> S. M. LIPSET and J. J. LINZ, *The Social Bases of Political Diversity*, Stanford, Center for Advanced Study, 1956, mimeo. Only a small part of the information gathered in this collection was later presented in LIPSET's work *Political Man*, *op. cit.*

in a comparative analysis of the cohesion and distinctiveness of party electorates:<sup>83</sup> they did not want to use micro-data to test propositions at the level of individual voters, but to generate typologies of macro-alternatives as a step in the formulation and testing of higher-order hypotheses.

Such shuttling between different levels of comparative analysis is likely to become common in most fields of social science inquiry. It is of course no accident that the examples of such procedures so far given have come from comparative politics. Anyone concerned with nations as units of analysis must of necessity consider dimensions of political decision-making - not only because nations define areas of homogeneous practices in data gathering and data evaluation, but also because so much of what happens and is registered within a nation reflects conflicts and compromises among political elites and within the populations they have been able to mobilize. In this sense, all cross-national comparisons confront the social scientist with tasks of political analysis: no body of social science data, even purely demographic or linguistic, can be compared without some consideration of the political contexts in which they were generated.

#### IV. The Organizational Infrastructure

We have reviewed a great variety of cross-cultural and cross-national studies and tried to account for the principal differences in methodological style and theoretical orientation. We have touched upon questions of research organization only incidentally. In this final section we shall endeavour to spell out in some detail what is known about the organizational basis for the internationalization of the social sciences and shall focus particular attention on the functions of UNESCO and its satellite bodies in the advancement of comparative social science research.

The current generation of social scientists has, at least in the nations of the West, been caught in the cross-fire of two conflicting sets of demands: on one hand they have felt impelled to concentrate their efforts at data gathering and analysis in the many neglected fields of inquiry within their own nations; on the other hand they have felt increasingly convinced of the methodological rationale and the theoretical advantages of cross-community, cross-national and cross-cultural research. Market conditions for decisions in one direction or in the other vary enormously from region to region. In the United States resources in funds and personnel have been large enough to allow a small but expanding phalanx of comparativists to concentrate their work on cross-national and

---

<sup>83</sup> R. ROSE and D. URWIN, 'The Cohesion of Political Parties: A Comparative Analysis,' Paper, International Voting Conference, Loch Lomond, July 1968, later published as 'Social Cohesion, Political Parties and Strains in Regimes,' *Comparative Political Studies* 2, (1) April 1969, pp. 7-67.

cross-cultural studies. In Latin America national resources have been meagre and the decisive thrust toward the establishment of regular research services has frequently come from abroad, through the organization of cross-national studies.<sup>84</sup> In Europe there has been a continuous increase in the flow of funds for social science research but a marked concentration on distinctly national tasks. Europe offers a remarkable range of opportunities for detailed cross-national research: there is a wealth of data still to be tapped, there are broad bodies of national experts to draw on for advice, there is increasing interest among policy-makers in studies cutting across the national and regional units.<sup>85</sup> Curiously, little has as yet been done to exploit these opportunities. Significantly, some of the first initiatives came from American scholars and were backed by American funds. Europe-initiated and Europe-financed studies have so far been few and far between. An early example of joint European research was the two sets of parallel group experiments and sample surveys carried out in 1953 under the auspices of the Oslo-based Organization for Comparative Social Research.<sup>86</sup> Perhaps the happiest example of a jointly financed and cooperatively planned international study was the twelve-country survey of achievement in mathematics,<sup>87</sup> planned at the UNESCO Institute of Education in Hamburg, and financed by the us Office of Education (for the international costs of the project) and by national funding agencies in the twelve countries (for field operations). This project constitutes a model of international academic cooperation, and shows that it is possible to achieve solid results through the sharing of responsibilities among many national teams. It further illustrates how UNESCO and other international bodies can perform an important brokerage function in linking up American and European initiatives.

The Research Committees set up by the International Sociological Association have prepared the ground for a similar linking of initiatives but so far the plans for concerted action can be counted on one hand. The Committee on Social Stratification and Social Mobility pioneered the organization of a series of cross-national replications and offered a fruitful forum for methodological and substantive discussions. The current three-country project Metropolit is a direct outcome of discussions within the Committee.<sup>88</sup> Europe is clearly ripe for a variety of cross-national initiatives. What has been lacking has been an organizational focus, a concrete institutional basis for concerted action. Alexander Szalai's spectacular success in inducing research workers in a dozen coun-

<sup>84</sup> For details see the report by G. GERMANI on the IS SC Conference in Buenos Aires in 1964, *Social Science Information* 4 (2), 1965, pp. 150-172.

<sup>85</sup> See the recent OECD report *The Social Sciences and the Policies of Governments* Paris, OECD, 1966, especially pp. 79-80.

<sup>86</sup> H. DuiJKER and S. ROKKAN, *op. cit.*; see also the special number of the *International Social Science Bulletin* 7 (1) 1956; cf. S. ROKKAN *et al.*, *Comparative Survey Analysis*, *op. cit.*

<sup>87</sup> T. HUSEN, *op. cit.*

<sup>88</sup> C. G. JANSON, 'Project Metropolitan', *Acta Sociologica* 9 (1-2), 1965, pp. 110-115.

tries to join the cross-national time budget study must be understood against this background.<sup>89</sup> The **UNESCO** decision to set up a European Co-ordination Centre for Documentation and Research in the Social Sciences at Vienna came just at the right time: communications between sociologists in the East and West had reached a point where cooperation on concrete tasks of empirical research was possible, and the regional organizations of the West were concentrating their efforts on purely economic studies and could not offer a minimum of infrastructure for cross-national research in central fields of sociology.

The successes of the Vienna Centre and the **UNESCO** Institute of Education in Hamburg hold important lessons for the future. Cross-national research requires an institutional framework, an organizational basis. Great plans and important pilot studies may be born of haphazard encounters between enthusiasts, but a cumulative tradition of cross-national research can develop only within a clear-cut organizational setting.

Demographers, economists and to some extent educational scientists have been able to build up broad international professions within the framework of large-scale intergovernmental organizations: the **UN**, the Regional Economic Commissions, the World Bank, the **OECD**, the **EEC** and **UNESCO**'s Sector of Education all offer continuous opportunities for experience in the handling and evaluation of data masses from wide ranges of countries and help to foster genuine cross-national expertise.

There is no such firm basis for cross-national endeavours in the other social sciences: in anthropology, sociology, or political science. There is some movement in the fields closest to demography, economics and education. It is interesting to observe that the two Research Committees of the International Sociological Association which have come closest to the development of a cumulative programme of cross-national studies are those focused on the Family and on Mobility, both centring on variables close to the concerns of demographers and both relying heavily on data from enumerations or from surveys close to the model of the census. It is also significant that the ISA has so far been unable to mount an active Research Committee for the Sociology of Education. There is already a basis for cooperative work on educational statistics in **UNESCO** and the **OECD** and therefore not the same need for an institutionalization of personal communication networks.

In other fields of sociology it has proved much more difficult to develop continuous programmes: there have been no institutional frameworks for long-term commitments to cross-national inquiries and, worse, hardly anything has been done to evaluate or standardize the production of data across any two or more nations.

---

<sup>89</sup> A. SZALAI, 'Trends in Comparative Time-Budget Research', *American Behavioral Scientist* 9 (9), May 1966, pp. 3-8; 'The Multinational Comparative Time Budget Research Project', *American Behavioral Scientist* 10 (4), Dec. 1966, pp. 1-31.

What can be done to strengthen the foundations for the internationalization of these underprivileged fields within sociology and the other social sciences?

The UNESCO Department of Social Sciences has explored several strategies in its efforts to foster an explicitly international orientation within these disciplines.

In its first attempts in this direction UNESCO focused attention on a few substantive fields of direct interest within its over-all programme: studies of the sources of tensions among nations and races, studies of stereotypes and prejudices, studies of opinions on international issues. The principal product of these early efforts of comparative research was the Cantril sample survey in nine countries in 1949, the study reported on in the volume *How Nations See Each Other*.

These early efforts did not generate a long-term programme. Large-scale survey research across a number of countries demanded a complex administrative apparatus, and the studies themselves came under criticism for their tendency to pursue abstract comparisons without consideration of the historical contexts and the structural conditions of particular response constellations. By the mid-fifties, the UNESCO Social Sciences Department was becoming more and more involved in promoting training and research in the developing countries, and found it increasingly difficult to pursue explicitly comparative studies.

An attempt was made in 1956 to launch a programme of comparative surveys, but this proved difficult to get under way. A small four-nation study was in fact organized but it was soon realized that this was the wrong tack.<sup>90</sup> In a sense the current efforts to advance cross-national research grew out of this realization of failure. It became increasingly obvious that UNESCO could use its limited funds much more effectively if, instead of organizing fresh comparative studies from zero, it concentrated its efforts on what might be called the *infrastructure* of comparative research: if it took on as a long-term task the establishment of better facilities for research workers interested in cross-cultural or cross-national analysis of one type or another. This, at least in the initial stage, meant a concentration on methods, on sources of information, on access to data for analysis. This new line found its first expression in the UNESCO programme for 1961-1962. All scholars interested in the advancement of comparative research have reason to be grateful to T. H. Marshall, to the late Andre Bertrand and to Samy Friedman for their efforts to make this new departure administratively acceptable within the UNESCO framework.

---

<sup>90</sup> See S. ROKKAN, 'Sample Surveys of Common Ideas about Foreign Countries', *International Social Science Bulletin* 9 (1), 1957, pp. 121-128; E. REIGROTSKI and N. ANDERSON, 'National Stereotypes and Foreign Contacts', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Winter 1959-60, pp. 515-528; and M. BROUWER, 'International Contacts and Integration-Mindedness: A Secondary Analysis of a Study in Western Europe', *Polls*, Summer 1965, pp. 1-11.

The International Social Science Council was given a central role in the development and execution of the new programme. The Council decided to devote the first set of conferences under the programme mainly to quantitative methods of comparison. The conference held at La Napoule on the Cote d' Azur in June, 1962, developed ideas on comparative survey research<sup>91</sup>, and the conference at Yale University in September, 1963, focused on aggregate national statistics and the possibilities of correlational analyses using nations as units.<sup>92</sup>

Both these lines have been pursued in subsequent conferences and publications. Work in the field of comparative survey data has concentrated on problems of data access, data archives, data retrieval.<sup>93</sup> Work on aggregate comparisons has been pursued in two directions. The Yale Conference recommended that the approach developed in the Russe«, et al. *World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators* be discussed in detail within each major region of the world in order to ensure broader coverage, better evaluations and more realistic analyses of the data at hand. A first regional conference under the programme was organized at Buenos Aires in September, 1964,<sup>94</sup> and a second in March, 1967, in New Delhi. The Yale Conference also recommended that data programmes of the type developed by Deutsch and Russe« should be supplemented by within-nation ecological archives to allow studies of the sources of variations between different types of localities and between advanced and backward areas of each country.<sup>95</sup> A first discussion of the development of such ecological archives took place at the Second Conference on Data Archives in September, 1964,<sup>96</sup> and a technical conference on quantitative ecological analysis took place at Evian in September, 1966.<sup>97</sup>

The IS SC has for some time made efforts to move beyond the exploration of such strictly quantitative methods and to take up other approaches to systematic comparisons among cultural and political units. At an international conference

<sup>91</sup> A first brief report on this Conference was printed in *Social Science Information* 1 (3), 1962, pp. 32-38. A fuller report and a selection of the papers were printed in a special issue on 'Data in Comparative Research', *International Social Science Journal* 16 (1), 1964, pp. 2-97.

<sup>92</sup> The papers of this Conference have been published in R. MERRITT and S. ROKKAN (eds.), *Comparing Nations*, op. cit.

<sup>93</sup> A report of the first Conference on Social Science Data Archives (Cologne, June 1963) was printed in *Social Science Information* 2 (4), 1963, pp. 109-114. The papers of the second Conference (Paris, Sept. 1964) have been printed in: S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Data Archives for the Social Sciences*, Paris, Mouton, 1966. For a report on further developments see R. BISCO, 'Social Science Data Archives: Progress and Prospects,' *Social Science Information* 6 (1), 1967, pp. 39-74.

<sup>94</sup> See reports in *Social Science Information* 4 (2), 1965, pp. 156-172, and in *Revista Latino-americana de Sociologia* 1, 1965, pp. 39-151.

<sup>95</sup> See report in *Social Science Information* 2 (4), 1963, pp. 98-103, and the chapters by E. ALLARDT, S. ROKKAN and H. VALEN in: *Comparing Nations*, op. cit.

<sup>96</sup> See Introduction to S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Data Archives for the Social Sciences*, op. cit.

<sup>97</sup> See the volume by M. DOGAN and S. ROKKAN (eds.), *Quantitative Ecological Analysis in the Social Sciences*, Cambridge, MIT Press, 1969.

in Paris in 1965 an attempt was made to map out a strategy for comparative research within three further fields.<sup>98</sup>

The first theme to be taken up was the *Cross-Cultural Method*: the qualitative alternative to the aggregate comparisons espoused by Karl Deutsch and his team. Bruce Russett and his collaborators chose as their units of analysis the politically and territorially defined entities termed *nations* and assembled the available quantitative data on their properties. George Peter Murdock and his co-workers chose as their units a sample of culturally defined *societies* and developed a system of qualitative codes for characterizing each such unit. Robert Textor went further and tried to organize, on the basis of such codings, a computer-produced *Cross-Cultural Summary* for a sample of 400 cultures. This great effort in data processing, at the time still only in the form of direct printouts, formed the basis for the discussion of the first theme of the conference.

The second and the third themes of the conference were closely related to each other: the discussion of *Comparative Analysis of Historical Change* focused on the building of nation-states in Europe and the West, and the discussion of *Comparative Analysis of Processes of Modernization* concentrated on the possibilities and limitations of generalized developmental models in the study of social and political change in any part of the world, whether in the older nations of Europe and the West or in the emerging units of post-colonial Africa or Asia. Notions of development, directional change, and modernization had already been extensively discussed within the issc programme, but thus far mainly in terms of the availability of codable and quantifiable data for systematic processing: data on levels and rates of growth, on differences between advanced and backward areas, on the spread of material and cultural innovations, on the speed of economic, social and political mobilization. But such data must be analysed and interpreted in a broader context of historical knowledge. The social sciences can become 'developmental' only through close cooperation with the students of the time dimensions of social life, the historians. For the first time within the ISSC programme, steps were taken to bring historians and social scientists together to explore how they could be mutually useful in comparative studies of nation-building and processes of modernization.

The discussion at the conference brought out a broad consensus on priorities in the development of cross-cultural and cross-national research. There appeared to be general agreement that the International Social Science Council is in a position to exert an important brokerage function in the advancement of comparative research across political, ideological and cultural boundaries. It was equally clear that the Council could not make much headway on its own: it has to base its action on initiatives taken at the centres of intellectual innovation in the advanced countries and to invest its resources in the development of faci-

<sup>98</sup> The papers from this Conference have been printed in S. ROKKAN (ed.), *Comparative Research across Cultures and Nations*, Paris, Mouton, 1968.

lities for cross-communication and cooperation among the most active research groups in the different countries. Great advances, it is true, have been made and can still be made through single-nation initiatives: as we have seen, the bulk of comparative data gathering operations have to this day in fact been planned in the United States and executed under some form of contract in the other countries of comparison. The International Social Science Council can contribute decisively to the development of world-wide cooperation among social scientists by opening up channels for initiatives from a wider range of research groups and by facilitating the matching of research interests across the boundaries. This is essentially the operational strategy of the European Coordination Centre for Research and Documentation in the Social Sciences:<sup>99</sup> this was set up by the Council in 1963 and has already established itself as a useful facility for a wide range of research groups anxious to initiate crossnational comparisons within Europe.

The experts assembled at the Paris Conference agreed to recommend further action within each of the five fields so far outlined within the ISSC programme. UNESCO and a number of national funding agencies have proved able to help the programme forward on a number of points. Work on the co-ordination of archival developments has been pursued and an international Standing Committee set up to ensure the fullest cooperation among archive builders, data management experts and social science users. A Standing Committee has also been set up for the planning and execution of activities in comparative cross-national and cross-cultural research. This Committee hopes to organize a series of symposia, training courses and 'data confrontation seminars' to familiarize a widening circle of social scientists with problems in the logic of comparative analysis. The Committee will invest a great deal of energy in the exploration of new avenues for linking up national analyses in a cross-national framework. With the arrival of the new generation of computers it will be technically possible to organize joint analysis sessions through systematic man-machine interaction: data from  $n$  countries for roughly the same range of variables will be brought together at one computing centre, reformatted to the requirements of the given machine, and subjected to a large battery of analysis procedures. Scholars from the same  $n$  countries will then come together to discuss alternative interpretations of the computer output and have the machine carry out a variety of re-analyses to increase comparability or to clarify cross-country differences while the scholars are still together. The idea, of course, is to avoid the besetting sin of most of the comparative analyses so far produced: the freezing of the analysis designs in advance of any consultations with country experts. There are obvious dangers in any such attempts at generating 'instant' comparisons, but the presence of scholars steeped in each national context should make it possible to reach workable solutions. A first experiment in this direc-

<sup>99</sup> See reports in *Social Science Information* 2 (3), 1963, pp. 90-123; 3 (3), 1964, pp. 70-76; and 4 (2), 1965, pp. 128-155.



tion took place under the auspices of the Inter-University Consortium in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in 1969 and focused on data for localities within some 10 advanced countries. It is hoped that similar experiments can be financed for other types of data in the years to come: data from sample surveys, elite biographies, aggregate 'nation-building statistics' for provinces and entire countries, HRAF-type data. This movement is still only in its infancy and is bound to encounter teething troubles, but there is good reason to believe that seminars of this type will increase in frequency: the computer and the data archive cannot fail to change fundamentally the conditions for the advancement of comparative cross-cultural and cross-national research. On all of these points, UNESCO, the International Social Science Council and its sister organizations depend heavily on the enthusiasm of devoted research workers in the national centres and on the good will of the officers of national councils and foundations. There is no cheap short-cut to the goal. The social sciences cannot be internationalized by fiat or from above: we must encourage the 'grass-roots' of the research community to take an active part in international work and this can only be done through conscious and continuous efforts to mobilize young recruits who will acquaint themselves with conditions and data in countries other than their own. Without a committed phalanx of enthusiasts steeped in a variety of cultural contexts, the computers and the data archives will not move us forward toward the goal of a world-wide science of Man and Society.

References for Fig. I\*

- a) H. GOSNELL, *Why Europe Votes*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1930, Chap. VIII; cf. S. ROKKAN and A. CAMPBELL, 'Citizen Participation in Political Life: Norway and the United States of America', *International Social Science Journal* 12 (1), 1960, pp. 71-72.
- b) H. GOSNELL, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-187.
- c) E. ALLARDT, *Social struktur och politisk aktivitet*, Helsingfors, Soderstram, 1956, pp. 30-33. The alternative proposition (that turnout will be highest in closely contested districts) was documented by GOSNELL, *op. cit.*, tables II (Britain), v (France), VII (German Reich), and pp. 199-201 (USA). Tabulations for Britain indicate that the highest turnouts will be found *either* in closely contested constituencies *or* in heavily labour-dominated ones: cf. H. G. NICHOLAS, *The British General Election of 1950*, London, Macmillan, 1951, p. 318. d) E. ALLARDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-59.
- e) H. TINGSTEN, *Political Behaviour*, London, P. S. King, 1937; M. DOGAN and J. NARSONNE, *Les françaises face à la politique*, Paris, Colin, 1955, Chap. VI; E. ALLARDT, *op. cit.*, pp. 124-130.
- f) S. ROKKAN and H. VALEN, 'Parties, Elections and Political Behaviour in the Northern Countries', in: O. STAMMER (ed.), *Politische Forschung*, Cologne, Westdeutscher Verlag, 1960, pp. 117-118.

---

\* See Fig. I. A typology of 'orders' of comparison: exemplified by propositions on electoral turnout rates, p. 15.

- g) Implications of findings in S. ROKKAN and A. CAMPBELL, *op. cit.*, not documented.
- h) S. ROKKAN and A. CAMPBELL, *op. cit.*, pp. 84-89 and 93-96.
- i) Not documented.
- j) Not documented: derivable from P. H. Rossi, 'Theory and Method in the Study of Power in the Local Community', Paper, Conference on Metropolitan Leadership, Northwestern University, 1960, pp. 37-42.
- k) This is TINGSTEN'S 'law of the social centre of gravity', *op. cit.*, pp. 170-172; cf. E. ALLARDT and K. BRUUN, 'Characteristics of the Finnish Non-Voter', *Transactions of the Westermarck Society* 3, 1956, pp. 55-76.